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* * * * *
Mr. Sudduth: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Sudduth; I am chair of the Depository Library Council and my first act is that I need to call to order the 69th Meeting of the Depository Library Council and the 16th Annual Federal Depository Library Conference. I hope everybody had a nice lunch, and I know it's getting cloudy outside so we're not missing any wonderful weather that we had yesterday, but again, I hope those of you who came in yesterday had a chance to enjoy the wonderful weather.

What I'd like to do at this point is have the members of council introduce themselves and we're start over here with Susan Tulis.

Ms. Tulis: Is this on?

Mr. Sudduth: Yes.

Ms. Tulis: It is? Now? I have to eat the microphone. Susan Tulis, I'm the Associate Dean for Information Services at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

Mr. Sandler: Mark Sandler, I'm the Director of the Center for Library Initiatives in the CIC.
MS. DAVIS: I'm Denise Davis; I direct the Office of Research and Statistics with the American Library Association.

MR. WARNICK: I'm Walt Warnick with the Department of Energy and I'm the Director of the Office of Scientific and Technical Information which is the science and technology information of the agency.

MS. FRANGAKIS: I'm Evelyn Frangakis and I am Chief of Preservation for the New York Public Library.

MR. HEMPHILL: I'm Peter Hemphill of from Hemphill and Associates, and IT Consulting Firm.

MS. PARKER: I'm Marian Parker; I'm the Associate Dean for Information Resources at Wake Forest University School of Law.

MS. STEPHENS: I'm Denise Stephens and I'm Vice Provost for Information Services and Chief Information Officer for the University of Kansas.

MS. MILLER: I'm Ann Miller; I'm the Head of Public Documents and Maps Department at Perkins Library at Duke University.

MR. BYRNE: Jim Byrne; Head of Government Publications Library at the University of Colorado in Boulder.
MR. SWINDELLS: Jeff Swindells; I'm a Documents Coordinator at the University of Missouri in Columbia.

MR. SUDDUTH: Thank you very much. We also have at the table we have Rick Davis, Judy Russell and Mr. James who will be speaking to us very soon. I do want to remind you that if you haven't had a chance to pick up your packet, stop by the registration desk. If you have any name badge issues, they can reissue your name badge. Your bag should have everything in it that you need. When you get a chance, look over the schedule. There are council plenary sessions; there are educational sessions; there are the tours on Wednesday which there are sign ups for. Those are all first come, first serve, so you need to get that into your schedule.

The other thing is that when we get to points in the plenary session when there is a chance to ask a question, there are microphones. We do ask that you identify yourself and what institution you're from. We have a court reporter who's taking notes and so please identify yourself, again, state your name clearly. There is a chance that the court reporter might come after you and get a spelling if they need to know how to spell your
last name. I've been used to it my whole life because not too many people can spell Sudduth correct on the first time. Other than that, I'd like to get to our main speaker this afternoon which is Public Printer Bruce James. Mr. James announced his intent to retire shortly after the spring council meeting. Those of us on council were left in a little bit of a shock and then disappointment. He has done a great deal for the GPO and if you've been keeping up with the news, he has received a lot of awards and particularly the government news civilian executive of the year award that he will receive this week, I believe. So Mr. James has done a lot to move the GPO forward and part of that was bringing on probably a excellent group of staff and he says that so himself, but he's also provided a lot of provost and vision to the agency and I will stop there and let Mr. James take over.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. JAMES: Thank you, Bill. That was a very nice opening combination of words; you missed wisdom. (Audience laughter.)

MR. JAMES: Maybe deliberately. Well, good afternoon, everyone. This is my eight opportunity to
address this group. How many in the audience have never heard me speak?

(Audience participation.)

MR. JAMES: Maybe you have to play catch up because I'm not going to go back to the beginning of eight years ago. Most of you in this room have heard me speak. Many of you were here when I first spoke eight years ago, and of course, that was in Reno, Nevada, conveniently located 20 miles from our home in Lake Tahoe, which I plan to go back to in the beginning next year. It was just one of those lucky strikes to have the first depository council meeting in my home town and it was quite an experience to look out in the audience and see, at that time, close to 400 people that had paid their own way out to Reno to attend this meeting. I was very impressed with that and do almost nothing at the time. I'm going to get into more about that as my real remarks start. But I have a special treat for us today. I'm going to introduce a person who will take a little bit of my time today and that is Carol Tullo, and Carol is with us today from London, and I met her, gee I guess it was first four or five months ago. I met her at the Houston sector. It was a dinner hosted by Alan
Weinstein. It was a small venue. I think it was around 20 of us there all together and Alan, of course, the arbiter in that state. He hosted this dinner and I was sitting next to Carol and we were chatting a little bit and before very long, it became obvious to me the reason Alan had invited me. Now, this goes back to even more than the four or five months that I met Carol; it goes back to a month or two before that when Bob Tapella, my Chief of Staff and I traveled to Europe and to Great Britain to meet with government officials to talk about their publishing programs, and of course, the idea there is that you want to make sure we understand what the major nations in the western world were up to, what they're thinking about, how they're dealing with government information. And of course, on our agenda was meeting with Her Majesty's Stationary Office which is the one that produces the government information in Great Britain. It was wonderful meeting with those folks and we probably just been consumed with another office, the office that Carol has and Carol appeared in Washington to announce that her office and the (inaudible) printer were being merged into the National Archives. So Alan's intentions became clear to me; he was thinking about how
we can merge GPO into the National Archives I'm sure. Well, we had a special night and really enjoyed the opportunity to meet Carol.

Carol is much like many of the folks that we have in our government and some of the folks that have been tracking the GPO in that she didn't start out with the government services, rather she started out in the private sector. Carol is a lawyer; she practiced at Barrister in London for many years and her specialty was intellectual property, and when the government played the power, Tony Blair asked her if she could come in and join him in helping to put a new government together. He initially gave her three-year contract, now almost nine years later, she's still there. So I guess she was seduced as many of us have been by this very great challenge that we face in how we deal with government and the issues of the future. She has an office that is called -- let me make sure I say this office correctly. It's the Office of Public Sector Information, and rather than explain to you what it does, I'm going to invite Carol to the podium to talk to you about that office, what its doing, what it's up to, why it's being merged into the National Archives in England and sort of share
with us where they're going. Carol?
Give her an applause.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MS. TULLO: Good afternoon, everybody. I'm delighted to be here to sort of bring a breath of England to your Washington conference. As Bruce mentioned, over the last few months, I have had the opportunity to look in more detail about what is happening in the United States and compare and contrast it to what is going on in the United Kingdom. I'm here today to just spend a little bit of time, 10, 15 minutes, just giving you a brief flavor about how we all are actually sharing the same vision. Despite a lot of comparisons that are made between the U.S. Federal system and the United Kingdom system, I actually quite amazed, surprised and delighted that in some of the meetings in the last four or five months that colleagues here in the Government Printing Office share the same language, the same challenges, same concerns, same issues that we're addressing in the United Kingdom. In fact, the mirror image from we are doing in really trying to identify the tools to interpret and safeguard these wonderful assets that I am certainly responsible for which is government information.
I'll just give you a little brief history about where I'm coming from. As Bruce mentioned, I come out of Her Majesty's Station Office and of course in common with everything English, we have to have mutual time for multiple history, but going back about 300 years ago, her majesty's station office, HMSO was set up really to propagate and to disseminate official information and official publishing. So my agreement as Controller of HMSO is to look after all official publishing and legislation and although the United Kingdom is made up of England, Whales, Scotland and New Zealand, because of our constitutional position with the Queen and Crown of Head of State, we have a coherent approach across the whole country. It does mean that anything produced by government, our prime ministers, our officials, and ourselves, is protected in public by something that we call Prime Copyright. This means that there is one right owner and so there is one person which response is divulged to me, this one person who has the citizenship of the information, assets, data, databases to ensure that we have a consistent quality to let people find, use, share, reuse and possibly trade in government information. And we utilize the use of that information
to ensure that it remains accessible and people can get a
hold of it.

The changes that emerged in the United
Kingdom started over ten years ago when her majesty's
station office, very much like GPO, still had its
printing process and its bands and its shops and the
government took a decision at that time that their assets
should go into the private sector, meaning, my
organization was very much responsible for the policy and
for the decisions and for managing the content and
controlling the effective publication of official
material and legislation through a contractor. So it's
quite a big change in the United Kingdom. The whole
streamline of my organization is to move forward and all
about unlocking the use and the value of public sector in
the nation.

HMSO exists as an independent organization.

It operates within the Office of Public Sector
Information which is only about 14 or 15 months old and
reflects very much a United Kingdom focus in that
ordinary people out there that want to have access to
what's going on in government, they don't really
differentiate between what's happening at what we would
call the central government level, the federal level and at the local level. They just know that the most elementary rules, regulations, systems, processes are designed to help them operate the system and need guidance as to how to really map out that territory. And so, within the United Kingdom and within Europe, there has been a big push to acknowledge that there is a wealth of information and it is very important to the citizen and the citizen can easily have access and to use that information and that there should be a simplified and integrated approach, and that public sector information or peer finding is really very new to the United Kingdom. I mean I've been using it and I've been tracking these changes for probably about two to three years, but it's quite a new concept in the United Kingdom where central government and local government are very different. And so what we're trying to do is to develop those tools to help interpret and use and let people map their way through this wonderful asset that we look after. It does mean that in our industry and in our service to the public that was really designed for print that we struggled and we faced a lot of challenges to meet demands for people like yourselves. I, within my budget,
have something called public access schemes. Part of those public access schemes relate to a subsidy for what we would call for public libraries, designed many, many years ago where somebody would walk into a library and would want to access a major volume or a collection of data from a government department or through legislation, the world has changed. The world started to change in the United Kingdom in 1995 when the first official government website came Online. People now don't buy hard-copy print official publications. There is no market. In the UK, the majority is online access, and you will know, your specialists, your advice, you will know that that is brought with it real demands and challenges for organizations like my own which is trying to deliver and improve services right across the board. Just producing material online isn't enough. It's not just a replica of print on the screen. There needs to be search tools, there need to be links, there need to be collections and connections. We want to harvest information. We want to find out how best to use that information. With that comes enormous structural changes in how we run our business on behalf of the citizen and the taxpayer and that's been a very challenging operation
and opportunity, as Bruce says, that has kept me in doing
my job as it's developed in my nine years.

We have, as well as reviewing the subsidy
from first reviewing a lot of the traditional subsidy
from print into online. There's a lot to do with
government money, so we've had to carry out some very
extensive public consultations in the United Kingdom and
we've have to ask people like yourselves how are users
going hold of official published materials and what are
your preferences in how we move and resolve new systems
and new opportunities to deliver that information in its
most appropriate package, it's most appropriate medium.
And so we really started to transfer large portions of
the budget into improving online services. Most of it
helped, it may sound very recent, but in 2001, the United
Kingdom government took what for it was a very ambitious
step and made available, at no charge, any official
information on the government website and that was a big
change for us, and it means that anything that's
officially published is free for people to download, use,
add value, do whatever they want and it's a simple online
website that allows people to do that. In plain English,
we've gone away from the legal jargon, all designed to
say that we have a responsibility to deliver information to as wide as possible audience and not be confined.

Recognizing that what we would call "legal deposit" in the United Kingdom that there is not an element of this custodianship of official information and data that means that people should always be able to have access to it, that it just doesn't just disappear once it's been updated on the website, as you will appreciate has brought us enormous challenges because it just gets bigger and bigger everyday, ever year. To give you an example, which may sound puny by your standards, but in the United Kingdom, when I first came into office in 1997, my organization's website was then barely a year old and it had about 15,000 users a month. 15,000. Now it's over 25 million. So that's just in nine years. So in a way, it's a very trite and simple analogy, but it shows you about the big the changes have been that we're all trying to adapt to. When I look back at legislation that goes back to 1172 on the Magna Carta and I've got beautiful, beautiful documents in the Henry Gates divorce settlement, whatever it might be, within my responsibility, I've also got the latest piece of legislation that's going through the UK Parliament or the
Scottish Parliament and you just realize that this is almost mind blowing and too much information to get our heads around, but it brings with it huge responsibly to be innovative, to be creative but not to forget that actually the person who matters is the person that wants to use that information and make sure that they have continuous access to it.

We are very concerned, very concerned indeed that as our knowledge has grown in the government that we have discarded and made inaccessible, huge amounts of material because we've been struggling to catch up with the technology and those challenges and opportunities, and one of the reasons why, the National Archives in the United Kingdom and the public sector information and the other offices which I hold within my office, are merging; the merge takes place at the end of this month. And that's a recognition that the whole information life cycle in government will benefit from having an effective link one place within government to really ensure that there is clear sense of alignment with all this information policy and management strategy. I'm sure it won't be perfect. I'm sure it won't answer all the challenges and problems and issues that arise, but the
big campaign running the United Kingdom at the moment, and we're not sure yet about free data and we do have a copyright regime; we do waive copyright and a lot of material. Within the UK, there's still a real need and concern in which for the authenticity and the integrity and accuracy of information to be recognized. It may not always be the case but if you feel it's a symbol that you will see in a circle and the words "Prime Copyright". At the moment, it is free to use and it tells you who the authorship is. It tells you its coming from government and despite that staggering move, 15,000 to over 20 million a month accessing information, that's just on my site as well, what it's telling us is that there are just so many opportunities for people to be mislead and for others to misrepresent their connection with government and that it is important that we recognize what we have within the data. There is an advantage by the online access where we had to be a risk for us. We've not wanted to control every aspect of it, of this information situation cycle. And we feel we're doing job. I'm not one to boast and there is always room for improvement, but just to come back to where I started a few minutes ago, it was that shared vision and that mirror image that
we spoke the same language even though there is a whole ocean between us, but it really reinforced and encouraged me that we were going on the right road and I'm delighted to be here and I wanted to give you a little flavor of why I'm here and I look forward to absorbing some of the changes over the course of the next few days. Thank you very much for inviting me.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. JAMES: She got a lot more applause sitting down than you got when you first came up here. I think we very much appreciate you being here and we very much appreciate you sharing what you're dealing with and I think it is in many ways reflective of what governments around the world are dealing with. So as we look at our issues, we have to understand those issues of context. We're not the only country that's starting to figure out how to move into the 21st century. Carol brought up a subject that of course is very mysterious to me and to you in the way our country operates, and that is the providing local and federal information and you know the federal government in our country is very reluctant to reach into states or into communities in any way involve ourselves because of the constitutional separation. But
it was three weeks ago when I delivered a speech up at RIT to the National State Credits; they've changed their name from the National State Printers Association and they now call themselves the National Government Publishers Association. These are the people throughout the United States that have responsibility within a state for the public documents. And out of the session, there is a very strong interest among, at least that group of people, in talking to GPO about how we can work in concert with each other. So I think that my recommendation, and we'll see if people will follow me and follow up on it, my recommendation would be to bring together a group of folks in Washington to discuss that with members of congress, appropriate members of congress and their staffs and with GPO folks and Depository Library Council and folks throughout the country that would be representative of the issues because I think that even though we don't have a legal structure that would permit that, it may be that we can form an alliance that would strengthen both local and state governments as well as the federal government in delivering citizen services, which is what I hear more and more in federal government are the citizen services and I know that's
what you pride yourself on is providing services for your citizens. So I think this is something that deserves to be explored even though I don't see a clear path forward on it.

Well, it was when I addressed this group four years ago, and I didn't really know how little I knew. I sure knew something about printing and I sure knew something about technology, but I didn't know much about libraries and I didn't know much about how our federal government actually operated and in four years I've learned a lot from you and I've learned a lot from congress, but you know, harping back to what I talked about in that first meeting, there were big questions that were in front us. When I say in front of us, I'm talking about in front of us collectively and in front of the GPO. You know, the first question was could you be able to save it, and that was a very serious question because when I walked in the door we were broke and if we had been in private business we would have been in bankruptcy. This great revolving fund which had always been used to fund the activities of the GPO was in a negative number. It was a question about how we would make payroll. It was really a serious problem when I
walked in the door, and if you recall, the question was
should GPO be saved, not just could it be saved, but
should it be saved. And the executive branch, led by
Owen Bingham was saying obsolete; no longer needed.
Let's just walk away from the whole thing. If you recall
Ms. Daniels, who headed the office at that point, it
actually issued the tentative instruction to the
executive vacancies divided as GPO, directed on how they
wanted to do business. And I think that was a wake up
call to everybody. The question was could we be saved,
should we be saved. And what that really poses is a
question of what's the purpose of GPO and I got asked the
question frequently by people in this room and the people
of GPO and others was our middle name getting done away,
you know, was the word "printing" really hitting us and
really understanding what the heck GPO was all about.
So given the fact that we needed to figure
out what heck this organization is all about, you know,
where did we come from, what were our roots, what was the
purpose for creating the GPO and had that purpose truly
gone away. You know, I think the question was did its
19th century purpose makes sense in the 21st century. We
wanted to know what 21st century vision could be created
in the GPO, and that really meant could we get a consensus with all of the various parties involved beginning with congress. You know, could congress agree on a 21st century vision for what the GPO represented. Would the library community agree on the vision? Would the printing industry history shake its head up and down? Very important. Did the publishing, who is very, very different than the printing industry, would the publishing industry agree with the vision?

And then, last but not least, would our employees their union representatives agree with the vision? So the question was could we create a shared vision of the 21st century. The question was could we redeploy GPO assets from a print century, 19th century, printing embeveled culture into a 21st century visual organization. Would it be possible to redeploy those assets? When I talk about assets, I'm talking just about equipment and just about the people, just about money, I'm talking about people. You know, these are principal assets of any organization, particularly GPO. Could we redeploy our people in a way that would bring the 21st century answers to these issues? And then I think the question I got asked over and over again by this group in
particular, because you've seen an awful lot and you've had a lot of continuity in this whole process, was is where would the money come from to do this all if we were successful in creating the vision.

Well, I go back to what is probably the most important question: where would the money come from? It's pretty obvious that congress had no intention of creating a bundle of money to pave our way to get this job done. So again, could we figure out, using our own resources, how we would achieve that. So are we in agreement that those are the big questions? That's how I remember it anyway going back through my notes and going back to how I was thinking about things walking in the door. This was pretty overwhelming stuff. Could we do all this? Well, four years later, we are in a different position and I wouldn't say we're out of the woods, but I would say that we have come a long, long, long way together in a very short period of time.

The first thing we did was we were successful in creating the strategic vision for the future. This is no menial undertaking. This is very simple, the words that go into that little booklet we're all read or downloaded from the
internet, it makes it sound like that vision is just so obvious on its face that how can you not accept that vision, but as you recall, when we started this process, it was not a clear vision of how this should work. And I'm just amazed that we were able to get everybody onto the same page. Well, maybe I shouldn't say everybody, but I think that collectively, we were on the same page. I think there are still points that are disputed in that vision document. There are some things in it that librarians are still uncomfortable with, probably things that congress are still uncomfortable with, but by in large, we came together in working hard together that we were able to create that and that the Depository Library Council, really as your representatives, played one of the most important roles in doing this because what they did was working with us, working particularly with me, and I needed to be educated in what this was all about. As we look back and we tried to understand what GPO's roots really were and what this was really about. I mean it wasn't very long before we made our way back to 1813 and that we began to read about what our founding fathers talked about in protecting the republic and the fact that
they felt the most important protection for our
government was an informed citizen and that the federal
government had a responsibility to tell our citizens what
it was up to, and furthermore, they had to do it
proactively. And everything that has grown out of those
walls in 1813 today is still in effect. Everything
that's so important that millions support that premise
and in the days where the only way to accomplish that was
through printed documents in effort to organize a
government operation when doing that. If you recall the
history of this, there were people responsible for the
government printing, but it was in 1861 that Congress
finally said we want to simplify all of this, at least
simplify the congressional portion of it and have our own
printing plant, and we all know that printing plant is
exactly what GPO is today. In 1995, they were so
concerned about these documents that might've been
printed and nobody was keeping track it and so they
ordered that any appropriate funds spent on printing had
to come through GPO. Well, that might've brought a
little efficiency to printing but that wasn't the reason
for doing it; the reason for doing it was to be able to
catalog and keep track of federal documents. And of
course, the great Federal Depository Library system grew up. I'm not sure any country has something as -- has an organization like we do with the Federal Depository Library system. This has just been a great use for our country and at a time when you had two choices to see a public document, you could buy a copy for yourself or you could go to the Federal Depository Library and look it over. This was an incredible service with the library community to compete with. And out of it, of course, we need to recognize the library system was more than just important from the standpoint of offering these citizens services, but the thing to understand that the library system could protect our systems against the federal government. I'll share with you the story. You may have heard me speak of these stories to get the point across. I was giving a speech in Nevada not so long ago and questioned the audience from one of those folks that likes to put a little needle here and there. "Well, Mr. James, now that you've been in printing for a while, how do you feel about gun control?" And I said, well, I was ambivalent on the subject when I went back to Washington; I now feel that every citizen ought to have a gun to protect ourselves from the federal government.
Well, of course that's a metaphor for what's really going on here. And that is if any of you have ever seen the King of Scotland Idi Amin, you know this is a person that didn't start out as a bad person, he first started out with a vision of how to help people and ended up being one of the great villains in the history of the world. And the government is nothing but people and I think there are two issues here, one of the people that are in policy making positions and who would might at some point be eager to rewrite history and the others are bureaucrats who have a single-minded focus in trying to accomplish one purpose and lose track of everything else. You can see an example of that in the National Archives with Professor Blienstein was completely blown away when he saw this program in classifying government information. He had no idea that was going on. So here are well intentioned people who don't completely understand the consequences of their action. So what the library community has done is ensured our citizens that the integrity of the story of America stays in place, nobody can change it. I think that is an extremely important purpose in this community.
Well, got this vision and then we got our finances under control and you know, it doesn't take a genius to figure out that most of the money we were spending was in people, and as the processes have changed and have been automated, we didn't need all the people we had. And so we went about reducing the workforce by a total of 30 percent. Now we did this in cooperation of congress and our unions. There wasn't a single problem that developed as a result of that because we looked at what the demographics were and we realized that almost 65 percent of our people at GPO were due to retire. And so we gave them an incentive to take early retirement. We did it in three ways, ten percent, ten percent, ten percent to bring down the employment down to 30 percent. And that more than anything else caused us to go from red ink to black ink. We also shut, as many of you are aware of, we also shut down about 15 GPO facilities around the country. Many of those were bookstores, some of them offices and one printing plant which were completely -- were buildings operated from a different era completely. So we just bit the bullet and did it. At the end of the day, what has allowed us to go forward, and to keep our finances in good shape is that we introduced the metrics
and that word is frequently misunderstood. What we did was we gave our managers, supervisors and leaders the information they needed to get results and measure results. We didn't count on that. We didn't know what to expect on running a printing press or moving documents in one part of the country to the next, we just had no metrics. And so we created metrics in giving our leaders the ability to make intelligent decisions and guess what, we give the people the information to make intelligent decisions, they generally do. So we now are running much more efficiently. Now, what's that's done is create a situation where we now have our own capital because we are generating the profit, and the government has had an unusual word that that we don't use very often. For those of you who have had responsibility in the private sector know that profit is used to reinvest in an enterprise that doesn't mean equipment and investment in new people and that's exactly what we're doing. We're using the money to regenerate, the funds have been generating to reinvest in GPO and reinvest in the people. We've added -- we're still are at about 30 percent. We've added 300 new people into the organization. Now, these aren't the same folks that we've added to the
organization, 10, 20, 30 years ago, these are folks that have interesting backgrounds. We have physicists, chemists. We have mathematicians, computer scientists, a whole wave of people with plenty of essential skills that we need to be successful in the digital world.

Now, think about the power we have. We have roughly 2,500 -- well, we got down to almost 2,200 traditional GPO people that have the right attitude, the right willingness to change, had a hunger to change, and we added around 300 seasoned people, about two-thirds the private sector and one-third from other government agencies. We brought them to GPO to work along side of our traditional course. Well, you could have two things happen: one is the existing books could've rejected the new books. They could've said we're not interested and just shoved them off to the side. Where the new people could've come in and treated the existing people in a patronizing fashion, but neither one of those things happened. I'm still amazed at just how well they've come together and today they're working side-by-side.

Newcomers have shared their contacts, have shared their technical knowledge, to share their skills to the folks inside the organization where we moving in a much faster
rate, I think than anyone expected. We now have the
beginnings of a truly 21st Century workforce at GPO and I
am really, really proud of our people.

Now, we have 23 union workers in the GPO, and
this is a little mystery to me walking in the door
because I never worked for the union before. I heard
stories, the same kind of stories that you all have heard
about how difficult it would be to work in a union
environment. I can tell you unequivocally that some of
the best leadership that GPO has been the union
leadership. They've got it. They knew it when I walked
in the door. They understood that we had to make these
changes to remain viable. They didn't obstruct us, they
were there pushing us to move faster and I thought about
that and thought about that. Why is that so different
from the stories I've heard in the private sector, and I
think that it really has to do with the story of GPO.

We're a nearly 150 year-old organization and we've been
through technological change after technological change
over the years and each of those changes made us stronger
and created a future for us. The unions don't view
technology as a threat, they view it as a friend. And
all we want is the opportunity to be able to adjust,
embrace and do those jobs of the future. And so they
have been just unbelievably supportive of all of us as
we've gone forward. We flatten the organization. A lot
of you have heard about the story of how I had 39 people
reporting to the Milwaukee, and I guarantee you're not
going to (inaudible) and so my philosophy is to push
decision making down to as low a level as you possibly
can. Now, that's easy to say and very easy to put
together, but you have to be able to give the people
you're pushing the decision making down to the
information for making and coming to decisions. So it
tips is a rock that blaming this flatbed organization and
pushing decision making down to the point that now it's
(inaudible). Give you a good example of what we're doing
today. It used to be in my office, for probably 100
years in my office, all of the decisions were made about
capital investments, one guy signing off on all of the
capital investments. Well, we established three years
ago a strategy and planning council and they're the ones
that took the strategic vision and began to map it to
what the real important ideals for GPO was to make our
investments to accomplish that. And so each year, these
folks meet, not with me, but they meet among themselves
and these are not the top names in the GPO, they're generally the deputies that run the various function of GPO and their job is to take the pot of money that is available and split that pot of money up in the ways that make best sense. I saw that they did that and I saw the results come in. They got it about 95 percent right. Five percent of it is still invested in the 19th Century and I could've stepped in and stopped it, but you know, I figured that they would figure that out faster if I let them go with it. The next year we didn't have any 19th Century investments and I believe that they are making even more intelligent decisions than I would make if did it with my top two or three people. And guess what, they have to live with those decisions and they know they have to live with those decisions and so they are the ones that will be deciding where the money will go into the future of GPO and again, I think it's a very impressive process that we've got.

You also understand that because GPO was losing money four years ago and have been for some time that it stopped spending money on things like training. We spent $27,000 on training the year before I walked in. In general, in our history, we spend between three and
five percent of the payroll on training and our payroll is only $130 million a year. So you see, we're just a little off of how much we're spending in training. I had been on the job two days when they said we had to spend our budget for the next fiscal year and I had no idea, but I think that training has $3 million in it. How will we ever spend $3 million? I don't know but we'll figure it out. And we began to address many areas. One of the areas that we had concerned about is spending money in traveling. We can save money by not putting people on airplanes and sending them away to see what's going on. It's an important that we know what's going on. Departments did nothing. I looked at partnerships; we didn't have any partnerships. We didn't have partnerships with government agencies. We didn't have any partnerships with private industries. We didn't have any university partnerships. We didn't have any partnerships and so in trying to figure out how to get our arms around that as quickly as I could we put up, as you recall, the office of innovation and technology, and it was my vision to have that co-chaired by an inside person at GPO, a person who had been at GPO and a person from the outside.
Well, we identified the inside person as Scott Stovall right away. Scott is one of our brightest and young executives and one of the people that kept his head above water on his own money and his own time had gone out to see what was going on and all that. He had a good sense of technology. And him by himself for the first six months of his employment, all of a sudden we started seeing every major technology company in the world visiting GPO and see teams of our people go out to visit them. We began to look at universities and understand the technology that was going on there and about six months later, Mike Walsh joined us as the person from the outside of the Office of Innovation and New Technology. And most of you know Michael Walsh and many of you have gotten to know him quite well over the last few years. Mike brought a career of innovation and technology from the private sector. Mike was probably 50 years old when I offered him this job and Mike was the US inventor of the year in 1996. He holds a number of US cabinets and is one of the few people to ever develop a large scale visual system that actually worked. And it was just at a point in his life where his kids went through college and he had enough private capital that he
could afford to come into GPO and this, as he said, would be the biggest challenge of his career. It may be the biggest challenge for any engineer or scientist out there. And Mike came in and became the chief technical officer at GPO as well as the innovation of new technology and out of that office, Scott Stovall and with almost no budget, and working countless hours in the early days four years ago, it's grown into the future digital system that you're all lodging the result and we'll see next year and we'll clearly be the most innovative in the world when it comes to government information. It's just a remarkable story. It's being built in large by folks at GPO, and we're using outside contractors, we're not from not preventing anything with GPO, but the system itself is being built by long time GPO employees that have come to work in Scott and Mike's shop and again, it's incredible to look at what they're doing. It's a real opportunity and what I like about this is that they're learning a disciplined process with building system and particularly digital systems. So long beyond Mike and me, the folks at GPO will continue this process of reinvented ourselves for a long time to come. And I guess the last thing that I have a note to
myself here is that the efficiencies that we gave by
developing metrics and properly measuring more operations
caused us to become much more efficient and therefore,
some of the funds that we appropriated which congress
appropriated in previous years that we still had work to
do on them, we didn't need as much, and the combination
of those funds are what's paying the bills for the future
digital system. So we found a capital that we're
building from our operation, but we're just making it
more efficient. Again, it's a remarkable story and is
more privy to our folks.

As I move on, and this will be the last time
that I address the council and the last time that I
address you folks as public printer, although I may
address you in some other way, but as Public Printer this
will be the last time I do it. I thought about those
things that I think you need to be, you the council, you
GPO, you the library community, getting the federal
information which is vital to the community. The things
I need you to be thinking about is that GPO is going to
need your support and help to make this come true.
First, is that the Federal Depository Library has been a
one way street that turns up moving information from the
government to you, but one of the things that we discovered in visiting libraries, Judy and I discovered in visiting libraries in this country is that many of our Federal Depository Libraries have a treasure trove of government information. Much of this information was created for local and regional purposes. Somewhere national documents for one reason or another just never made it to the government depository library system. I'm telling you that there is more information out there than that we have in the whole history of the Federal Depository Library Program. We think about the industry. How do we get the information that you have back into the Federal Depository Library system? This is much more of a two-way street in the future. It's something we hadn't really addressed yet. It's absolutely paramount that you can all address that with GPO.

I think that I'm coming to the point where I'm seeing the realities of a political situation being such that "congress" is afraid of going back -- I say congress in quotes, and I'm not speaking of any specific individual here, but the institution is apprehensive about GPO's plan to digitize the retrospective copies. Now, we can not have a complete system for our citizens
unless we go back to the beginning. So I think we need
to address the question of working with local or another
private company and working with them to identify the
documents and helping them to digitize those documents
retrospectively would that be good enough to give a
start? It may not even under the wrong one, but is it
good enough to get us started and to be a real boom and
of value. I think you need to be asking those questions.

I think GPO needs to be asking those questions of you.

I talked a little bit to Bill about my
responsibility that I think you have for preserving the
record. Now the first time I got asked this question two
or three years ago at a public session like this was
well, if GPO has all the information electronically, you
know, shouldn't we have that information scattered around
the country in 2,000 or 100 or 500 other areas too? I
tell ya, that's the dumbest question I ever heard from a
business standpoint, but from a government standpoint,
I've come to understand that's a real question. That is
a real question. And I think again, this is something
for the depository community to take a look at. You have
to understand that printing is going away. I just can't
tell you what year it's going away. But do we want to
leave all the government information -- GPO could make
this (inaudible), we're never going to lose it. I mean,
we're not going to lose any of those issues. The
question is it is under the control of the federal
government and is that good enough? I think this is the
question I think we need to ask and congress needs to
take a look at too. I suggest to you that we don't have
a solution to this yet; it is something that should be of
interest to everyone.

In short, you must accept the fact that at
some point in the future, all government information will
be produced digitally, distributing digitally and it
won't be printed. I can't tell you what date that's
going to be. It won't be five years from now; not likely
ten years from now; highly likely in 20 years from now
it'll be the case, and if that's the case, you know,
we've got to start planning for what the heck that means.
I mean, before with all these artificial claims like,
we've stopped progress, you know, I've seen road blocks,
I've seen tacks put in front of us, that, you know, I
think has stopped stop the progress of technology and
we're not going to stop it. So I think that we have to
realistically come to grips with what's the path, what's
this look like. You've heard me say from this podium
that I don't think GPO should be the one that stops
printing documents. I think you should be the one to
decide whether printed documents are no longer necessary.
And I strongly believe that rather than quibbling this
stuff that we ought to come to a consensus of what is so
important right now that until we can trust these future
digital systems, we need to be printing, and really,
truly, we don't want to wreck the red skirt. But there
are other key documents here too that must be taken into
account until you all are convinced that we are the point
that we can authenticate information and that we can
control versions of information and that we can keep the
digital record in perpetuity in they way that it will be
used -- well, I think that you all know that we are very
close. I think the world of the digital system will help
you to gain more confidence in that, but I wouldn't want
to at this time next year say okay, let's stop. I think
over some period of time we've got to come to that
conclusion. But more importantly, we need to look at
right now on what's the need, what are the implications
of this because I think it creates opportunities to do
things in different ways that you've done before. I
think there are opportunities where you can do a much
better job in helping our citizens and we've played
around with the margins with some of this stuff but we've
not really focused on what does that mean. What are
these services and what responsibilities the federal
government has, what responsibilities do you have, where
is the training coming from in the future, what does it
look like. I think these are the things that are really,
really, really important to look at.

Lastly, I will expect that I will get to ask the question, you know, how can you best help GPO? Let me tell you something. We wouldn't be here where we are right now if most of you in this room did not really support us to get to this point and I thank you for how gentle you were in the beginning. I thank you for the times you grabbed me by the collar and spit me out and got me to understand the point you were trying to make. We've come a long, long way together and GPO has been the beneficiary of the support of libraries. But I can tell you one big issue that is not obviously important to you but is the most important thing to you in the long term, and that is the financial viability of GPO. I am blessed to receive these wonderful letters each year from the
presidents from the Library Associations. Almost all of my presidents went to congress to support my appropriations requests and as you probably know, your community is very generous and not just supporting the request for the appropriation and the library program, but also supporting our other request too and I'm gratified by that. Plainly, the most important thing would be if you continue to support GPO in redeveloping the real estate and getting into a new location. I can not begin to tell you how much money is being dragged down each year by trying to operate this obsolete facility. You know, we estimated four years ago that is was $35 million a year -- absolutely pouring down the drain. That's what it costs to keep an obsolete facility open. That doesn't stick to the hundreds of millions of dollars of assets that we have tied on North Capitol that are our deductive assets that can be turned -- that can turn our taxpayer's money into assets. And that's the money that GPO used to continue to invest in the future.

So ask you, as the leadership of GPO comes to you to ask for your support this area, I think your support of this, that your education of your members and
their staff and the importance of this, is the single
most important thing you can do for the future of the
FDLP, and with that -- I probably ought to say a couple
of other things here. I just want to thank you for your
great role of sharing. We've had some great chairmen,
but in the last year, I'm not sure we've ever had a
better leader and I really appreciate the utmost that you
put into this and your values and your council, and those
goes for everybody else. This is the best group that
we've had in the time that I've been here. I say that
every year, don't I?

(Audience laughter.)

MR. JAMES: I do. I say that every year, but
it is. It gets better and better each time. I know that
every one of you have important roles that demand 110
percent of your time. The fact that you're willing to
give up a chunk of that time to provide your guidance and
help us. I can tell you that we very much appreciate it.
So thank you, council. Thank you all, it's really been
a pleasure.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. JAMES: I think that probably sums up my
remarks. I'm now open some questions. This has been a
great, great, great experience and I stand before humble
at being given the opportunity by the President to come
in and work in the support area. You know, I feel like
there's a certain cap in my career. I have enjoyed every
bit of this experience, as has my wife. Well, every
minute -- more like 99 percent. It has been in many
ways, a life changing experience. I think I come away
learning more from this experience than I brought to it.
To those of you that have been so good about sharing your
experience and sharing your guidance, I really appreciate
it and that goes for everybody who's ever groomed me. So
let me see if there are any questions here before I sit
down and shut up.

It's always nice to be so completely thorough
in your remarks that you leave the council speechless.
This is the first time I've ever done it.

(Audience laughter.)

MR. SANDLER: I'll just break in here just to
avoid awkward silence. You mentioned that you thought we
should increase relations with some of the big private
sectors out there, Google specifically, and I'm sure you
think we ought to be looking at Yahoo and --

MR. JAMES: Sure.
MR. SANDLER: Could you say a little bit about how you're thinking it has evolved on that over three or four years or the thinking of staff that's involved in that over the last couple of years?

MR. JAMES: I think boils down to the political reality of the situation. The easiest part of my job in the last few years has been the business of technical parts. I mean, what we had to do was restore the GPO profitability and the technology that we need to bring in order to increase that stuff. The thing about this is that it is complex, and frequently I find myself looking at what I can practically get done as opposed to what would be the best business decision. When I started my time here, people would ask, you know, is printing getting in our way; should we change the name of the government printing office. I looked at that and I looked at that and I thought, yeah, I probably should, but holy mackerel, the energy it would take and the hearings and the public law, you know, I can spend my entire tenor trying to change the name of the GPO. So I went to our design shop and said, "Any thoughts on our new logo?" And they said, "Ah-ha" and pulled out of the draw something that was worked on three years before,
which is that wonderful GPO symbol. So I said we'll be back. It was three months later when I was speaking in Chicago and one of the people in the audience raised their hand and said, "Did you have to go to congress to get permission to use that new logo?" And a light came on, "I don't know, but we did it anyway." So, you know, congress does not get excited about changing logos, they get very excited about changing names and the technical side of things. From a business technical standpoint and our assessment of what it would take to have GPO go back and digitize the documents, its well within our capabilities. It should've been done. We should be well into that process now, and it can be done. Congress, however, is that there type O, anti progress that one leg is slowing us down for our demonstration project. I mean, they don't, for whatever reason, and I'm not sure that we'll ever really truly understand the reasons, but for whatever reason, they didn't even think we could go forward. So I think that the reality is that to get this done, we may just have to throw our hat in with "a" or several private sector vendors.

Now, one of the big vendors came to us a few
years ago and offered to do this in exchange for the
exclusive rights in about a three-month window, and we're
not going to give away any exclusive rights anyone. On
the other hand, they couldn't even get this job done
unless we can find the job and work with them in setting
up a certain standard where it can done at the price that
they had agreed to do this for and we would have the
information. Now, the reason I was reluctant to embrace
that is I think that once that gets done, it's going to
be awfully tough for the government to go back to spend
the resources to doing it a second time to do it right.
And by "right" I'm talking about making certain these
documents are scanned in a way that you can do searches
and you could bring up the exact document on a page and
have a resolution that's meaningful, and again, a
document that would truly useful.

So, by allowing or partnering or however you
want to put it, going ahead with the private sector
vendor, I think we cut down the chances of being able to
do this in future, but we're so far behind in doing this
and I don't see us moving along forward here. So, I
think I may know a way to do it. I think that you all
need to discuss it and see if this makes sense and if it

does, you come put pressure on us and put pressure on
congress to do it. I think congress wouldn't like for me
to use the word pressure. We haven't had these
discussions and I think it's time to have these
discussions.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill from
Hemphill and Associates. I guess I'd like to share a
little information with you with regard to how private
sector handle retrospective collections and that it's a
huge issue and it's a lot of money, but what we found is
if you have just the current information moving forward
it kind of came to ripping pages out of a dictionary and
it only has a certain amount of usefulness by having a
lot of those pages missing and not being able to search
on and find it. You end up having to go back to the
paper collection again and it generates inefficiencies.
What we ended up doing is developing with our partners a
means of electronic data from authenticated partners that
had secured methods of updating things through a
federated approach in order to provide information to be
able to republish that information.

Many of the customers who use our products
needed that historical information and we're getting that
information and we're more than information by us coming up with automated data interchange standard and authenticated means and secure means in providing that information into the products and it really helps the efficiency of searching, the ability for people to find things and as time went on, the retrospective side just shrank and shrank and shrank to the point and time where we said well, there's not enough left to be a major concern and we just went ahead and did the rest.

MR. JAMES: We need these discussions. We need to look at what this means and how do we go about doing it and you know this is to get it done.

Yes, ma'am?

MS. HALE: Hello. I'm Kathy Hale --

MR. SUDDUTH: First, we would like council to ask questions and then we'll go to the audience.

MR. JAMES: I got this messed up. It's my fault.

MS. HALE: No problem. I can wait.

MR. SWINDELLS: I'll make this quick. I welcome this conversation. I think this is a great idea of the realities I think of the expertise that is out there. The one thing that I would like to see added is
to include our nonprofit partner out there. You know, people like Mike Holley. The Federal Reserve is involved in lots of great visualizations of projects and our universities around the country are involved in this kind of thing. So I think that bringing together all kinds of partners could be a really profitable exercise.

MR. JAMES: Good point.

MR. SUDDUTH: Not to put your successor or noose around your neck or tie their hands behind their back, but if your successor came to you, once named, and said who are the three people that I need to go talk to outside of GPO, what might you tell them?

MR. JAMES: I'm not going to answer that question because I might leave somebody out that is really important. I thought about creating that list and I would certainly turn over to my successor public information and my thoughts of what the priorities are in going forward and how to get there and I will share the names of people who have come to be quite helpful. A lot of this stuff is personality driven, you know. You like somebody and you want to tell them or you like somebody and you want to ask them questions. So I think that we don't want to limit the next person with who they make
contact or who they should go to, but I leave a pretty
good list.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other questions from
council?

MR. JAMES: Thank you for your patience.

MS. HALE: No problem. My name is Kathy Hale. I'm from the State Library of Pennsylvania in
Harrisburg. First of all, I wanted to say that I feel
that you're wrong in that it's been one way between GPO
and the Federal Depository Library community. I feel
that we have had a very active voice in telling you how
we feel and what we want.

MR. JAMES: Kathy, let me stop you right
there. You weren't listening to me.

(Audience laughter.)

MR. JAMES: I want to answer this very
quickly because I thought about it when I was saying it.

What I'm saying is that similar to the partnership where

if anything, maybe the federal government has gotten more
out of this relationship over the years than we put into
it. I'd be willing to take that back. What I talked
about here is the flow of innovation to our customer, the
patrons, the users. The flow has been through GPO to the
libraries and I think that what I've seen out there is
that there is a whole lot of information out there that's
federal information in local libraries, in state
libraries, in specialized libraries that I think the flow
back to Washington to incorporate into our systems and to
literally put right information in there so that we open
up a vast treasure trove of information to American
citizens, and we, at GPO have not addressed that yet.

MS. HALE: And that's what I would like to
address. I know that we have treasure troves out there
because we get to deal with that everyday, but there are
fugitive documents that have never been brought into the
FDLP. There are local consortiums that have wonderful
information that we had been willing to give to GPO and
GPO has not had the vehicle in order to accept it. So
that is what we would like to voice is that you get on
the stick and accept it from us.

(Audience laughter.)

MR. JAMES: So we're together.

(Audience laughter.)

MR. JAMES: I mean, I'd be surprised. You
just have no idea, I mean, maybe you do. I mean, you're
in the business, you do. I'm surprised at the amount of
information out there. As I say, much of it is local or regional (inaudible) and so people have virtually no access to it and no understanding it even exists and it could be quite helpful to, not just for researchers, but I think citizens would find the information quite helpful too. It's just amazing the way people are using government information systems today. You know, you've heard me say that ten years ago, of course, when the federal register was in paper form, we had 35,000 paid subscribers and that's all people who ever saw it. Now we have doubled the people in that registry. So we've greatly expanded the usage of it and I think that there is a treasure trove of information out there. We can see millions and millions of people a day coming to the internet to access this information and I realize that GPO has never had the ability to do this and we also don't necessarily have the franchise to do it and so this would be a matter of working with not just with the community but also with congress to make sure that congress is comfortable with this. This is one that I think they would be quite comfortable with this. Thank you.

MS. HARTNETT: Hi. Cass Hartnett with the
University of Washington, Seattle. When you were in Seattle and last addressed us, I believe you were on the eve of dealing with Supreme Court Chief Justice. I think it was a year ago.

MR. JAMES: So you want to hear what we talked about?

MS. HARTNETT: Well, yeah.

MR. JAMES: Well, I can tell you that it was just PR for GPO. In fact, I did meet with the chief justice and it was a small meeting. I found him to be even more charming in person than he appears to be in the media. I mean he appears to be funny and charming in the media, and obviously unbelievably smart, and we had a range of things to discuss and among those, I brought up the changes in the way people are using information and the fact that I thought that it was time that the federal courts took a look at this and that they understood the technology and what the opportunities were. He mentioned that there was a change of management going on in the administrative office in the U.S. Courts and that that's the way we should pursue it. Now, he did remind me that the Court's are quite considerate and not out just to branch off in one direction or another. We're
approaching this a couple different ways. We have established a relationship with some service where our business from $5,000 a year to over a million dollars a year and he was amazed of how we were going to this and we continue to operate the Supreme Court's website which has sent a clear message to everybody that we're on the line in the system. And so we're pursuing this and I think what we've read from this is that we don't have the same access to the information the Court's do with Congress and their Executive Branch. Of course, the issue, as people are quick to point out to me is that there are many private sector publishers in this field that certainly what we do doesn't threaten their livelihood, but having been in that sector myself, I think there are many things that the federal government can do to improve communication with our citizens regarding the Courts that in no way threaten the livelihood of private publishers. Again, we have a plan that we are working and we'll continue to work that plan and realizing that the Courts are different than the other parts of government. It just works differently. I think we're seeing changes take place in the system that we have hope for the future.
MS. MCKNELLY: When are we getting a better name for it?

MR. JAMES: What do you mean?

MS. MCKNELLY: I mean it's really getting hard to talk about this thing and call it a business anymore.

MR. JAMES: Good point. We were talking about running a contest about six months ago to name this thing. I thought that would be an interesting idea to come up with a name, but I said oh, my goodness, this is going to be nightmare. So I think that all of us have a favorite name and if I were a betting man, I would bet on Mike Walsh's name, the Walsh System.

(Audience laughter.)

MR. JAMES: Sorry, Mike, I didn't want to give away your secret there. I think that we have to have a better name for it. We realize we have to have a better name for it. Michelle, I think it will involve -- I understand what you're saying.

MS. NELLY: It's really getting hard to go and talk to a member of congress about something called the system, you know, if there was something there that we could talk them about it and then, you know, tell them what it meant and why it is important to fund it because
the funding down the road is going to be very important
and we can't advocate for it with this silly name.

MR. JAMES: That's a very good point and I stumble over that name all the time, so I don't even try
to say it anymore. I just call it future digital system.
We're working on it now, and how soon that will happen,
I don't know. I guess it hasn't been a high priority,
but after this comment, I'll go back and revisit it with
our folks and see if we can move the schedule up a little
in creating a name for it.

Once again, the money to complete the future
digital system is at hand. We have it on the agenda.

It's funny that we created it within the GPO, but that
doesn't mean that we will not be supportive of Congress
on an ongoing basis to be able to implement that system.
Now a lot of what we're doing makes it easy to refresh
and not use big bites down the road, but we will be in
support of congress. Your point is well taken. I'll
take that up. Thank you.

MS. MILLER: I just want to mention, you should call it something that has operation in front
because will fund anything with operation in front.

(Audience laughter.)
MR. JAMES: Point well taken. Point well taken, at least with this congress.

MR. LINDSEY: I'm Tom Lindsey from the University of Texas in Arlington. I have a question about the building project. George Shultz, foreign affairs over in Arlington was a one-time proposed headquarters for the defense (inaudible) which is now down in Bolling Airforce Base. Under the legislative scripture where you can be but so many miles of the radius distance of the Capitol dome or something, does that keep you from moving the GPO to the site plant or is it a big problem if you can't?

MR. JAMES: Well, you know, early on in the process, the senator and I talked about this. He said you guys can't do that out of town. He said, we have you right there, right by the capitol and you've got to get that record down here every morning. And I said, well, let's think about that. You know, in 1895, we retired horses and brought electric trucks into this and ever since we've had the ability to get it to you by truck. So the answer is that we have to be able to reliably and predictably deliver the Congressional Record on time every morning and not get stuck in traffic. Other than
that, we'll be located in Washington or Maryland or
Virginia or anyplace that Congress is close to. Now, we
have done site investigation and there are I believe --
Bob, how many sites in D.C. have we identified?

MR. TAPELLA: We've identified approximately
23 within the metro region.

MR. JAMES: Twenty-three sites all together in
the metro region?

MR. TAPELLA: Yes.

MR. JAMES: And over half of those were in
D.C. So we will not have trouble finding a place to
house GPO and we have a way of doing it that it won't
cost the taxpayers a dime. Now, you think this is a
no-brainer, but believe me. The ways and wiles of
Washington are still mysterious to me in many ways. You
know, we got done what we could get done and, you know,
we took no prisoners when we couldn't afford to take
prisoners and we went out and got the job done. This
building area is something I really wanted to get done
and I didn't and so I need you to focus on that in the
future. Thanks. Thank you all.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. SUDDUTH: For the next part of the
program, council is going to adjourn themselves from the stage so that there is enough room up here to get the ceremony done and things aren't as cluttered, so we're going to take a couple of seconds to gracefully exit ourselves.

(Brief recess.)

MRS. RUSSELL: This is the time where we present the winner with their award and hear their remarks and accommodations for them and then we're going to adjourn at the room at the back of the room to actually present them with the shadowbox that they can take back and hang in their library and to have our coffee break and cake and that will give you a chance to congratulate them individually. So I'm going to turn this over to Ms. Ruth to actually do the presentation of the award and then Ric and I will present some of the other accommodations.

MR. JAMES: It will be my honor to make all the appropriate introductions here. I've got a million different things here. I'm sorry about this everybody. Okay. I'm ready to go here.

Our library of the year award goes to the Benton Harbor Michigan Public Library and Fred Kirby is
here to accept the award.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. JAMES: Now, I know that everybody here has been to Benton Harbor Michigan, probably on vacation. I will tell you that my first trip to Benton Harbor Michigan was when I was 21 years old. Now, we know that Bentonville, Arkansas is the home of the world's largest retailer and it would only be fitting that Benton Harbor, Michigan be the home of the world's largest maker of home appliances, which is Whirlpool. As a 21 year-old salesman for a company called Counter Crescent in Burnsville, Indiana, who is producing Whirlpool Corporation's annual report. It was my job to, this very important job, to carry this annual report to the chairman of Whirlpool and I just couldn't believe that I was being trusted to do this and I was reading this proofs of report as I was going up, and I'm 21 years old and I'm reading these proofs and I see the numbers and I go holy, mackerel, here's this huge appliance company where 70 percent of all of their output goes to one company, Sear Roebuck, and I'm thinking this must really be a dangerous kind of business to be in. So I got there and I met with John Platt, who was the chairman at
Whirlpool and he sitting there with all these various financial people to meet with us and I'm sitting here trying to figure out how I'm going to bring this up to Mr. Platt, point out to him what jeopardy his company is in for having 70 percent of his sales to one customer. So I really worked on that. You all know about that song and so I finally said, "Mr. Platt, do you have trouble sleeping at night?"  "Well, what do you mean?"  And I said, "Well, with 70 percent of your sales all going to one customer, what would happen if the boss woke up one morning and said I'm not going to do business with Whirlpool anymore?"  He said, "Sears Roebuck would be in serious trouble because there's not enough capacity in the rest of the world to even meet a quarter of their requirements. He's the one that should sleep not so well."  So that was one of my great grand lessons in business which I had never forgotten.

Benton Harbor is perhaps one of the important industrial cities in this country. This is the twin city area. Am I right?

MR. KIRBY:  Right.

MR. JAMES:  It's in many ways the heart of America and like so many different cities that are these
powerful industrial cities, Benton Harbor has also fallen on lean times and it's very difficult when you operate a public library or operate any kind of public facility in a city where you have declining tax revenue and have more and more calls do deal with the problems associated with the community and so what has really struck the GPO is how clever the folks at Benton Harbor Public Library have been in dealing with these issues and making certain that they derive a way of continuing to provide government information in new and very creative ways. So for that reason, we've decided that you, Fred Kirby and your colleagues at Benton Harbor Public Library deserve this award.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. KIRBY: Thank you so much Bruce and Judy. I can not believe I'm standing here. This is just incredible to get this wonderful award from the GPO. Our library has come a long, long way over the years. It was a lot of hard work to get our document collection to where it is today and of course, we did not do it alone. Now, there are far too many people for me to acknowledge here today but I do want to pick out a few in particular if I may. Certainly, first of all, all the librarians
get a heart-felt thanks from us. We could not have done this without all of your collective support for us, so thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. KIRBY: In particular, I'd like to acknowledge Ann Marie Sanders. She's the Documents Coordinator for the Library of Michigan. Ann, would you stand up?

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. KIRBY: Thank you, Ann, for what you did. Also, Diane Vanderpol, who is the Documents Librarian at Calvin College in Grand Rapids. Diane?

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. KIRBY: Thank you, Diane. You're the one who nominated us, not once, but twice. So thank you so much for your support and your persistence too. I do want to thank Judy Russell and all the members of the Federal Depository Library Council for believing in us and realizing the value of the program that we have there. But finally, I need to thank Jill Raugh, who is my Record and Documents Librarian. Jill, it was your vision, your creativity and your hard work that made all this possible. Without all of that, we wouldn't be here,
so thank you, Jill.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. KIRBY: I just want to conclude by saying that next year in 2007 will mark the 100th anniversary of the Benton Harbor Public Library being a depository library. What better way to start the celebration than this.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MRS. RUSSELL: All right. Although this was a secret until just now, we did share it with a few individuals who we thought might like to acknowledge this and so we're going to start with this video from Senator Debbie Stabenow acknowledging Benton Harbor, the recipient of the Federal Depository Library Award. So we'll see that first.

(Whereupon, a film was played.)

MRS. RUSSELL: I'm also going to read you a letter from Senator Carl Levin addressed to Mr. Kirby. "Dear Mr. Kirby, I would like to congratulate you and the entire staff of the Benton Harbor Public Library for being named the 2006 Federal Depository Library of the year. Unfortunately, I am unable to join you in person for the award ceremony but I'm delighted to offer my
congratulations to all of the individuals who have worked so hard to make Benton Harbor Public Library such an exceptional institution. In order to insure openness and honesty in government, it is essential to have citizen to have free access to government documents and publications. I commend the Benton Harbor Public Library staff, not only for its commitment to providing citizens with access to a wide range of government resources, but also for presenting these resources in a manner that's so directly needed in the community. You and your staff certainly deserve this national recognition for your continuing efforts to provide outstanding public service. Again, it is my honor to salute the Benton Harbor Public Library for being named the 2006 Federal Depository Library of the Year. Sincerely, Carl Levin.”

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MRS. RUSSELL: We haven't made a lot of remarks here about all the reasons why Benton Harbor received this award. Congressman Fred Upton has done that for us so we decided to let his words speak to some of the reasons why the library received the award and I'm going to read now a letter from Congressman Upton to Mr. Kirby and his staff.
I would like to express my sincere regret that I can not be with you today to honor the hard work and well-deserved recognition of the Benton Harbor Public Library. As you all know, there are now over 1,250 libraries participating in the Federal Depository Library Program and I am extremely proud that this year the FDLP in conjunction with the U.S. Government Printing Office has given the Benton Harbor Public Library the prestigious distinction of the 2006 Federal Depository Library of the year. For over 140 years the partnership of the FDLP and the GPO has worked to provide federal government documents and information packets to the American public with the belief that an informed citizen is an empowered citizen. The Benton Harbor Public Library was chosen for this prestigious honor due to its outstanding an innovative public service. The library staff has worked tirelessly to provide the community with vital statistical information from federal government documents. Such information has been essential to the work of community planners, business persons and other professionals. Additionally, the library's extensive collection has helped support a local task force established by the State of Michigan to study and make
recommendations on such issues as housing, education, employment, criminal justice, parenting and family law. In addition to making its contents available to area libraries and its patrons, the staff has worked diligently to make government documents accessible through an online catalog, the library's ability to provide physical primary text whether it was a copy or a book version. There is a tremendous honor and source of pride for the Benton Harbor Public Library. The library's resources have not only been beneficial to the working members of the community but also to its youngsters. The staff has created a colorful and dynamic signage in the library to its patrons and worked diligently to facilitate relationships with each visitor to provide a comfortable and welcoming environment. The staff at Benton Harbor Public Library is a true testament to the first class library we are so fortunate to have in Benton Harbor. I want to commend the Federal Depository Library Program and the U.S. Government Printing Office for selecting the Benton Harbor Public Library as the 2006 Federal Depository Library of the Year. This honor must serve as a great source of pride to the folks of Southwest Michigan. I applaud everyone who has worked
and continues to work with the Benton Harbor Public Library, for their dedicated work is undoubtedly a positive influence on our community and its citizens, very truly yours, Fred Upton, member of congress."

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. SUDDUTH:  Good afternoon.  I'd like read several additional tributes and accommodation, but before I do I think we have a video by Governor Jennifer Grant Holme.

(Whereupon a video was played.)

MR. SUDDUTH: Next, I'd like to read a special tribute and this is from the Michigan State Senate. "Let it be known that it is a genuine pleasure to commend and congratulate the Benton Harbor Public Library on being selected as the recipient of the prestigious 2006 Federal Depository Library of the Year Award. This award is presented by the United States Government Printing Office. "The Benton Harbor Public Library has received this award for its outstanding public service and its promotion of federal government information. Lead by the library's dedicated Director, Frederick Kirby and it Records and Government Documents Librarian, Jill Raugh,
the Benton Harbor Public Library is only the fourth library recipient of this honor. Working with extremely limited funds, the library staff has worked diligently to transform a previously marginal federal government depository into a vital and successful local community and regional library resource. The library is a great asset to the state of Michigan and merits are highest praise. This special tribute, therefore, this document is signed and dedicated to commended congratulate him for the Benton Harbor Public Library. We applaud this fine achievement and wish them continued success.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. SUDDUTH: We also have a letter from Wilce Cook, the Mayor of Benton Harbor. "Dear Mr. Kirby, congratulations to you and your staff for receiving the 2006 Federal Depository Library of the Year Award. This is an extraordinary achievement which benefits our citizens to appreciate how we have such a remarkable public library. Your hard work and dedication to providing quality service to the people of Benton Harbor is exceptional and it speaks highly of the dedication you and your staff towards providing information in an accurate and user-friendly manner. You are making access
to federal government information easier to the public
which educates our citizens. Again, thank you for your
service and congratulations."

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. SUDDUTH: And last but not least, the
Benton Harbor Public Relations Library Board of Trustees:
"The Board of Trustees at the Benton Harbor Public
Library would like to formally thank you for the
continued outstanding performance in your efforts to
serve the public. Specifically, we congratulate you for
our library being named Depository Library of the Year.
As you know, Benton Harbor has been a depository library
for government documents since 1907. Citizen access
share information about the national government and its
activities as the (inaudible) of the democracy. Through
your continued efforts to make the documents accessible
and relevant to the needs of the public, you have brought
high honor to our city, our library, the depository
library's council and yourselves. On behalf of the
citizens of Benton Harbor and Benton Township, the
Library Board of Trustees thanks you for the good work
that you continue to do, Sincerely, The Benton Harbor
Public Library Board of Trustees."
(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MR. SUDDUTH: I want to thank you all.

Again, we're going to adjourn out right across the hallway and we'll have cake and a cake cutting ceremony. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 3:02 a recess was taken.)

* * * * *

MRS. RUSSELL: It was certainly wonderful to hear all those tributes to Benton Harbor and I hope you're all thinking about boy, how can I have my library up there next year because it'll only be a couple of months before we'll be looking at nominations for next year's award. So start thinking about your library or a library in your area that you think that is deserving of this kind of recognition. I have the great pleasure this afternoon to introduce both a colleague and friend, Dr. Jose Marie Griffith, who is the Professor and Dean at the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I first met Jose when she became a commissioner of the National Commissions and Library Information Center where she served as a Deputy Director and I had the opportunity to work with her on several projects commissioned. At that
time she was the CIO at the University of Michigan and she subsequently left to the Graduate School at Pittsburg. I had recently joined with the (inaudible) schools, so we have that additional connection. With all that said, I will tell you that I am not the one who suggested her to speak, although I should've thought of it. Ric Davis was in a meeting in North Carolina a few months ago and she was speaking and he said she would be wonderful and I said oh, of course, and so here she is and we're really thrilled to have her here. So I have one more piece of business here. How many UNC graduates are in the audience? Ah-ha, look at that. We have one, two, three on the council and then some more in the audience. Please be sure you leave your name, address and phone number -- at any rate, join me in welcoming Dr. Jose Marie Griffith.

(Whereupon, the audience applauds.)

MRS. RUSSELL: Okay, I think we're ready to get started.

Thank you all very much. I hope you enjoyed the reception and it was certainly wonderful to hear those tributes to Benton Harbor. And I hope you're all busily thinking about, boy, how could I
have my library up there next year, because it will only be a couple of months before we're going to be soliciting nominations for next year's award, so start thinking about your library or the library in your area that you think is deserving of this kind of recognition.

I have the great pleasure this afternoon to introduce both a colleague and a friend, Dr. Jose Marie Griffiths, who's a Professor and Dean of the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

I first met Jose when she became a Commissioner of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science while I was there as the deputy director and had the opportunity to work with her on several projects at the commission.

At that time she was the CIO of the University of Michigan. She subsequently went to the graduate school at Pittsburgh and then fairly recently, lost track of the time, two years ago, boy, it's been quickly, to the University of North Carolina as the Dean and I have recently joined the Board of visitors for her school, so we have that
additional connection now which is very nice.

With all that said, I will tell you that I'm not the one who suggested her as a speaker, although I should have thought of it, but Ric Davis was at a meeting in North Carolina a few months ago and heard her speak and said, wow, she'd be wonderful and I said oh, of course, and so here she is and we're really thrilled to have her here.

So I have one little piece of business. We want to know how many UNC graduates, library school graduates are in the -- aha, look at that, we've got one, two, three on the council and then some in the audience, so please be sure you leave your name, address and phone number so the development committee --

(Laughter.)

At any rate, please join me in welcoming Dr. Griffiths.

DR. GRIFFITHS: Thank you very much. I have known about this group for many, many years having spent 10 years here at, in Washington, D.C., during the 1980s, but I actually have to admit I believe this is the first time I've actually been to
a meeting of the depository libraries, so I'm glad to be here and I'm glad to meet you all.

When I first received a call asking me to come and talk about, come and to be the key-note, I wasn't quite sure what I should do, so I thought, you know, Ric had heard me speak in the research triangle area, I talked somewhat about futures there. I'm engaged in a fairly large-scale ILMS related funded project on the future of the work force.

Judy and I have had discussions about the future of work force. I've had similar discussions with librarians and library directors and others around the country, and so what I'm going to mix today is a little bit about the future from a technological perspective and some of the issues and concerns that I think we had as a profession as we move forward.

How many of you are familiar -- you know, I can, I've got these wonderful screens here which means I don't need my glasses, but I can't see the keyboard on the laptop, so excuse me for just a minute while I get my finger poised. Okay. No,
that didn't work. Let me try this one.

How many of you are familiar with the latest work that the National Science Foundation has put out on cyber infrastructure. So a few of you, good.

Well those of you who know that, I'm going to talk about it a little bit. Those of you who aren't aware of it, it is an important initiative that I think you need to be aware of.

I also want to talk about fundamental roles of librarians and information professionals through the ages because I think sometimes in our rush to embrace particularly in the schools of library and information science and our rush to embrace the new technologies, we sometimes forget what some of our fundamental roles and responsibilities are, have been and probably always will be. They may morph a little bit, but predominantly there's a lot to be celebrated about the role and value of librarians in this world and that's part of what I went to North Carolina to do while we look at moving forward.

I want to look at how these roles will
continue to be critical in the digital age. A little, talk a little bit about what's going to change and what's going to stay the same.

Quite a lot will stay the same, although it may be on a different stage. The role and responsibility will be the same. Skill sets might be a bit different. A little on trends and how librarians are responding and then future key issues. So it's sort of a pretty broad overview of the future.

I also should say I don't do these pretty pictures, I have somebody who does, illustrates my words very nicely, but she puts these wonderful pictures together and I don't have to worry about it, so I take no responsibility for the visuals here.

So cyber infrastructure. Cyber infrastructure is an initiative that Federal agencies in particular have been looking at but heavily over the last several years as information technology has evolved at such a pace and at such a rate that we can now not only do some of the things we've done before using technologies, but we
actually have created new and interesting ways to communicate, to create content, to share information, to disseminate information and we really are not at the moment operating in an optimized way.

Basically we are seeing silos of activities, Bruce mentioned this earlier on this afternoon, silos of activities that are not necessarily interoperable. And so one of my themes in speaking to groups like yours is, in fact, we have to shift our perspective from a siloed approach, almost, almost a systems approach, except Bruce said systems of the future, but I had, was taking a narrower view of systems into an infrastructure approach and if we think infrastructurally, then we begin to do things a little bit different.

You can imagine what it would be like if each house and each organization had to run its own power supply. I mean, you know, we just plug in and it's there and we take it for granted that it's there and it's something we only worry about when it's not on, when we have a power failure. We need
to start thinking about information in that way and how we make digital information because that's where the real potential is available in a more infrastructure approach.

I do believe that the future in driving us forward will be E science, E business, E Government, we can put whatever term we want there, E culture and global competitiveness are going to be critical drivers of moving us forward in this age and not so much the serials prices and the kinds of discussions that we have predominantly in academic institutions, although it's not exclusively there, they're not going to be the real drivers for change. The real drivers coming are much bigger and it's because the United States is losing position in many sectors relative to the rest of the world and we need to pay attention to where we're losing position.

We need to support the discovery dissemination and preservation of knowledge. This has always been the strength of the United States. It's what those of us who came from other countries to work here were looking to work with. You had the
resources, you had the infrastructure in those days that didn't exist in Europe, certainly at the time that I came to this country, and it's the reason why I came over here to work the -- the ability to work with very large-scale information systems just simply didn't exist in Europe at the time. Does now, but it didn't at the time.

And I wanted to talk a little bit and give you an idea of how this infrastructure can play. In, in space physics, upper atmospheric physics, I'm a physicist by background, so this is something I'm very comfortable talking about. You can imagine people want to look at the upper atmosphere and see what's going on and so they have telescopes and instruments in remote places that aren't covered by clouds, so that they are in Greenland and Arizona and funny places and places where you can access the sky. And those instruments used to be where people went to do their research, okay.

Now and for some time we've been able to control those instruments by the Internet remotely, and so now we can connect almost anyone in the field
to those instruments very easily.

What the upper atmospheric physics community did was to start working collaboratively to plan the kinds of observations they wanted to see, they call them campaigns. Okay, when they decide to switch certain instruments on, point them to certain places in the sky, gather data for a period of time, a fixed period of time, analyze the data and then see what was happening.

And that was a cycle that now could be facilitated by new technology as you can imagine. You know, we can have, change the instruments remotely, we can beam up the observations, beam them down from the satellites to a location and, you know, make others see it, give access to other people.

What happened was now you saw groups of people rather than working independently with a set of data or a set of observations started to work collaboratively with a set of observations. In other words, people could be online at the same time looking at the same observations, discussing how to analyze them, what the analyses meant, what the
implications were for theory, et cetera, et cetera.

So this kind of experimentation went on for some time and then the feeling was, gosh, you know, we experimentalists who are working directly with the observation equipment, when we publish our results, the theoreticians then take over, take the experimental results and then figure out what was happening and then develop the next step forward in theory.

And there's a time lag between theoretics, the next proposal of theory and the next experimentation. And what the technology enabled was the bringing together into the same conversation the theoreticians and the experimentalists, this is a very rich and elaborate conversation. This didn't happen overnight, it took many years for them to come to this point.

But the net result of their coming together and collaborating in this kind of forum, working together on what should the next experiment be, what did it lead to in the way of theoretical development actually began to reduce the cycle time of theoretical development in upper atmospheric
physicists and then the upper atmospheric physicists
having worked this way for some time and now feeling
comfortable with each other felt that they could
then move forward developing a framework for future
development of their field and collectively go
forward for funding.

So we began to see the experimentalists
and the theoreticians not working against each
other, but actually working collaboratively together
to make things happen in their science. And we're
seeing similar things now beginning to happen, you
know, high energy physics is beginning to work this
way with everything, you know, the super conductors
being located in Switzerland and no longer have all
of the facilities here in the United States. We're
seeing similar initiatives in bioinformatics. We're
seeing similar initiatives in distributed clinical
trials in the medical field, all enabled by a better
capability of technology that has allowed people to
re-think how they interact and how they work with
each other.

So, that's the kind of change that we're
looking to see as a result of cyber infrastructure.
We've seen vast improvements in, I'm sure you've all seen a slide like this, vast improvements in computing power, storage capacity, algorithm development, networking, instrumentation that's actually, I mean for those people who work with very large instruments now, the instruments are everywhere, you know, cameras and audio and biometrics instrumentation and so on. And we're seeing improvements in data and text mining techniques. All of this is accelerating very rapidly.

Cyber infrastructure is an opportunity to take advantage of these trends and developments and we think -- how we think the overall infrastructure needs to, needs to work. And this is, I'm presenting you NSF's current view of cyber infrastructure and it's a four-layer model. Basically the bottom layer has the basic technologies of computation, storage and communication, I mean that wouldn't surprise any of us and it's there, we're beginning to take those facilities for granted.

Above it we have the networking, the
operating systems and the middle where the security, the authentication, not document authentication, the people authentication and the glue that begins to hold systems together.

The next layer, can you read that, we have from the left to the right high performance computation services, data information, knowledge management services, observation, measurement and fabrication services, interfaces, visualization services and collaborative services. Lots of things there in that layer that we are all about. A lot of the content and a lot of the services that we deal with on a day-to-day basis are in that third layer.

The only comment I'll make about the NSF view is NSF's view of cyber infrastructure is very much focused on where NSF is planning to place its resources and so the only difference of opinion is in the high performance computation services, that the infrastructure has to contain more than just high performance computation, it actually has to include all computation.

NSF is focused on funding the high performance piece of that, so that when, if you look...
at this, and my slides would be on my Website, I think they already are, the high performance computation really should be expanded to say high performance media and low performance. I mean there's all kinds of performance levels of computation in that picture.

And then the fourth layer we have community specific knowledge, requirements for research -- environments for research, thank you, environments, it's even here. Let me put my glasses on, I can read it off the screen. It's sad when we get older.

Community specific knowledge, environments for research and education, in the middle, science gateways and science portals and then on the right-hand side customization for discipline and project specific applications. Again, the kinds of things in this room that we're responsible for that they should not be unfamiliar to you.

So the first message is that this movement towards an infrastructure approach, there's two things, first of all, it places content, content
slap bang in the middle of the cyber infrastructure piece.

I was at a workshop several years ago that NSF funded to talk about the future of the digital libraries program that NSF had been funding for a number of years. And the very last question that came up, because nobody really wanted to address it, was does the content become part of the infrastructure and I was the only person who stood up and said it has to be. It has to be part of the infrastructure.

So imagine a future where all potential content is part of the infrastructure. We no longer will have it siloed, it will be available or look as though it's available just as easily as your power is available by plugging into the wall. The idea by plugging into the infrastructure, you would have access to that content.

Now that's a long-term vision and we're a long way from that. But in order to achieve that kind of approach, it's going to have implications for the way we do business, the way we organize ourselves, and the way institutions, organizations
and businesses interact with each other.

Going back again to the comment that Bruce had made on collaboration, partnerships, alliances and so on I think is very much part of the future that we're going to be working in and we need to think that way. We need to think beyond our immediate constituents to say these resources could serve a broader public than they currently serve and the infrastructure approach is a way of broadening out and looking across, across, beyond, beyond our own environment into others.

So I think this is something that you should be following. There is a vision statement up on the National Science Foundation Website. I do believe that as NSF gets, is slated to get additional funding, if it does get additional funding, I would see more funding going into this area. There are other areas, of course, but the very fact that the National Science Foundation extracted out an office of cyber infrastructure from within the computing and information science and engineering directorate to its own division reporting directly to the director of NSF is
significant and it's good news for everyone in this room that that move actually occurred.

So it's doing, I think it will have an impact. Now it is not something that's just occurring within the National Science Foundation. The Department of Energy has already been working on an infrastructure approach and I worked on a committee with Walt and Science.gov was one of the products that emerged from that. The National Institutes of Health have a health, a health information infrastructure approach that's evolving very rapidly or health cyber infrastructure approach.

So this is just a different way of looking at things, but it begins to allow us to see how some things might be possible and that's one of the reasons why I want to expose you to this idea sooner rather than later because back in your own organizations you might want to start thinking about how what you do fits in with the broader infrastructure approach.

So the cyber infrastructure contains hardware, software, services, people and
organizations and this is a move away from, it's

just the hardware and software and content and so on. The people who are going to make it all happen, the people who are going to deliver services of the infrastructure are all very important and organizations are very, very important.

And of course in this sequence the hardest things to deal with are the last two, the people and the organizations, because I think, I think organizations perhaps even more than people because even if people are willing and interested, I see organizational boundaries one of the biggest potential barriers we have to making progress in really creating a strong information infrastructure in the United States. We already have more problems than some other countries.

Size is an issue. We have institutional boundaries, we've talked about Government boundaries. We have issues even within the Federal Government, we have issues with local Government and we have so many municipal and individual Governments that it becomes difficult, it become more difficult to do some things on a larger scale than we
otherwise might be able to do so.

So I think that this all means that if, in fact, we're to move forward, we're going to see, have to see more alliances and collaborations and partnerships because no single entity can deliver everything and these things will have to be inter-connected and inter-operable in interesting ways.

So, with that as background, the fundamental roles of librarians and libraries through the ages, you will know this I'm sure better than I obviously as collectors and stewards and I mean stewardship in a very proactive sense, not a passive sense.

Trusted collectors and stewards of our heritage, or of information of our heritage, and I use the word trusted very deliberately because I do believe that libraries and librarians are trusted sources of information and that trust is something that is built up over the years and it needs to be nurtured and cherished and marketed, if I could use that word sort of. It's very important that we
continue to maintain the level of quality, the level of authentication, the level, authentication accuracy that Bruce mentioned.

So trust is very, very important in our future. It's been very, very important in our past.

The importance and implications of collections are not always known at the time of their creation. We don't know and with the potential these days to collect almost anything, it's going to become harder to decide how to collect and what to collect and the tendency in a lot of places is, well, we collect it because it's easy and then we have issues of, you know, how do we maintain collections.

But I honestly believe as we move further and further into the digital age that the role of selection for collections, that doesn't mean you have to put them in one physical place, but the idea of identifying collections of related materials for particular groups of users and validating the content in those collections is going to be a very, continue to be a very, very important role for libraries and librarians, absolutely. I mean that
will not go away.

Collections have always included more than just books, although very often people will just associate the library with books. It doesn't matter how many people walk into a library and see other things, they still, by the OCLC report, still continue to see it as a place for books and as I understand that where the way the report went, a place for all books.

So we have to continue to get the message out and it's more than that. And then we have the function that's the big challenge for us, preservation and curation of the content, particularly the digital content as it's going to be as we move forward.

Big issues that I'm going to address a little bit as I go through, so I don't want to spend a lot of time on it, but preservation and curation are absolutely critical as part of our role in building and developing collections and stewarding those collections for the long-term.

Librarians are organizers of recorded knowledge. That's part of the selection process
into collections is an organizing function, but also adding value by classifying, cataloging and describing the resources. It's an interesting question as to whether we're going to be the only ones doing that.

We are already no longer the only ones doing that, so again, there's a question as to what extent and how can we take advantage of collective efforts to try and provide valid quality, trusted entries into the intellectual content of these collections. It's going to be very important. It's not going away. I've been on panels since 1970, something about will cataloging still be needed. Well I think so, I mean I really do.

And I don't see how it can go away. It's getting harder and harder for people to sort out what's there and while we're going to see changes coming, I think, if the people who really rely on information content to be able to do their work or get their education are going to have to come to the more formalized structured kinds of resources that librarians provide. Maybe not only librarians provide, but provide with valid input.
And then we're going to have to steward both the selection and the collection of resources into identified pools, if you like, I mean we talk about the Tsunami of information just to be a little consistent in the visualization there.

Enablers of access, we enable an equity of access to recorded knowledge for all citizens. Sounds very nice, but that's what we do, equitable access, we tend not to turn people away. Here is a quote that relates to some of the comments that Bruce was making this morning.

Democracy is malleable, it's tempered by the human behavior called free public access to information. And so what we are doing in providing access to information, and this will be particularly focused on providing access to Government information, I feel that that's absolutely an essential role for libraries of the future and we need to continue and fight for that.

And then there's the development and application of access tools and technologies themselves. As people who are helping people gain access to these collections of resources, you
probably have a lot of ideas on what works and what
doesn't work, what could work features.

So working with the developers, actually
engaging in the development, testing things out,
learning how to use these new tools and technologies
and making them available to our user communities
all very much a part of what I think the roles that
we've always played, and tools and technologies
doesn't all have to mean computers. In networking
it can mean everything from the application of a
simple classification scheme to something advanced,
super computing. It's all of the tools and
technologies that have come and gone.

And another role, educators, this is an
important role for the practicing library community
as well as those of us who are educating people to
be in that community. But educators about
information resources, it's hard to keep up, so

where do we go, how do we find out what's new, about
how to access and use those resources, about when to
access one's self, this is sort of the part of user
education, when should they do something themselves
and when to ask the librarian for help. Users are
sort of finding their way through that right now, but I think they could get some more guidance in that regard.

And then I do think there is contribution that libraries make and librarians make to value and economic growth and I don't want to belittle that when it relates to the whole metrics question. Work impacts, how does the use of relevant information content impact people's work, how does it impact their education, whether that's formal education or their informal and continuing learning as we go forward. There are personal impacts on how we do things, how we prefer to do things, the sources that we go to in a preferential way and then those impacts have impacts in the economy generally and job creation and the information industry that we encourage.

And so there are huge contributors to value and economic growth on the part of both libraries and librarians and it's interesting that the number of forums that I'm in where people can talk about the importance of information, information content, information technology without
recognizing the value of the trained professional in that equation.

So, it is important and you need to recognize that and we need to leverage that more in making the case.

So, if those are the roles and that's a sort of subset, you know, an extracted high level set of roles, how will they continue to be critical in the digital age. Well, we are seeing a new wave of young people coming into the University and into the work force. They are brought up on the Web and the endless flow of marginally-organized information, that's CNN, MTV, ESPN, et cetera, a flow that makes almost no distinction between the important and the trivial fact and speculation, authority and gossip. Students have little patience with the formal organizational structure of the library and the authority of the librarian.

Now, that's a statement by John Lombardi at the University of Florida. We see some of this with the waves of freshman coming in and of course each group is a little bit different, but in the end, once people are out in the work force, we're
not yet fully seeing this shift away from the organizational structure, but we are seeing a shift towards more kinds of collaborative environments in which sharing information is the norm.

Young people don't see the kinds of boundaries that we see. We've dealt a lot with structures in our world and they don't see structures, they just do, okay, they just connect and they share information and they send stuff around and heaven forbid when they come up for security clearances what is going to show up in their background. And, you know, we try and tell them don't put anything on the Web or in an E-mail you wouldn't want to see on the front page of the newspaper or you wouldn't want delivered to your mother or something like that to try and get people to think about it. But they are young people and they are fearless and they think it won't happen to them.

But as collectors and stewards, we still have need for comprehensive collections and trusted sources, so the idea of designating this is a trusted source, it's up to date, it's valid, it
comes from the copyright, that was another notion here, how do we market.

(End of Track 5.)

(Beginning of Track 6.)

DR. GRIFFITHS: How do we market these things and say they are trusted. There's a huge need for validated collections of digital materials, huge, and it's growing and the pace of that growth is such that we can't keep up with it, so, hence, my thought that the only way we ever really will keep up with it is to leverage some collective effort involving not just the library community but potentially the user community. And I think OCLC is starting with this, its new efforts to engage some of their end users of their services to add some meta data.

As long as we continue to have both digital and non-digital materials and, we should at least try and make connections between the two sets of collections. Now at this point you'd have to look at weighing the cost to do that against the cost to digitize those non-digital collections and that's an effort that will have to go on.
But the problem, one of the things that I found in academe over the last many years is how many Doctoral students don't reference anything before 1996, okay, because they go to what they can get easily. And we have, I mean I feel like sitting there with a flag, you know, saying there are other materials, go look at them. And we tried, but it's the general sense is that they don't and the general sense is often faculty don't force them to go further back, so they miss out on things and consequently there is sort of a certain rediscovery of certain key basic things.

And while redundancy is good in some contexts, in other contexts it's not very good, I mean it's a waste of resources.

So we have to relate these digital and non-digital in some sense or at least make people aware that there are resources that might be very relevant to their need that do exist in more traditional forms.

And then the whole move to digital creation and preservation which is, we've never, in a sense we've been running behind these new formats
for many, many years or decades, actually, and now
we suddenly have this huge wave of effort and now
how are we going to deal with digital creation and
preservation, big, big areas for us to look into and
be concerned with.

As organizers of knowledge, in the
digital world we have the challenge of incomplete
sources, lack of verification, lack of usable
indexing, search engine inconsistencies and
limitations. Most people who use Google don't
really know how it works. Most people actually
probably don't care how it works. Most people never
go beyond the first or second page of a list of
things.

So the concern is do people really know
what's happening. As I say, in some environments
maybe it doesn't matter but in other environments it
really does and we need to make people a little bit
more aware of what's going on and we certainly
ourselves need to be aware of what's happening with
different search engines and different capabilities
so that we can explain to other people how that
works.
As enablers of access, our libraries are going to continue to be a significant access point for people, physical as well as digital. Certainly for digital. The key question is whether they know they're accessing stuff that you've made available for them. The branding of the library is something that needs to be thought through. How are we going to let people know. I mean I love the little Intel inside little ding and we all know that the boom-boom is Intel inside. Somehow we have to have library inside and make people know because that's when, because they think they're getting it off the Web, or Google.

Okay, so that's something we need to think about as a profession, how are we going to brand the fact that we have a role here and that our piece in this value chain is very important.

And in a sense I've used the term knowledge prospectors. Librarians have to be knowledge prospectors for people getting them access to relevant and small nuggets that exist in this vastly growing area and the idea of prospecting is very different from the idea of a browsing of a
pre-formed collection.

So, if we're going to sort of serve people, we are going to have to go out and help them find it and bring it back and I see an interesting movements forward in the ability to create specialized on-the-fly collections, if you like, to serve particular purposes for maybe a particular clientele, but actually that could be broadened out to clientele that aren't necessarily in your normal user community, if that makes sense.

And then we're seeing this increasing demand have done for a long, long time for analysis and synthesis and levels of interpretation that people need and we're seeing some move to provide that kind of, that level of interaction. Sometimes by having librarians move from a central library out from a central organization of a library into product development groups, research groups, grand rounds, clinical, clinical environments to actually be more proactive and behave as the information analysts for a particular group and then those people become very heavy users of the central services that are provided by libraries.
As educators, librarians I think need to teach people about the issues of identifying and validating sources. How to effectively and efficiently use technologically-based tools like search engines and as libraries become more digital, more effort is placed as needed in the education of the user community. I know we say that, you know, young people are coming along with all these skills, but certainly in the academic environment we say they have a lot of knowledge about a lot of technologies, but it's very shallow, it's very shallow. They don't have a lot of deep knowledge about how technologies work. And then we need to teach people to effectively and efficiently use the information resources.

Contributors to value in the economy, I just wanted to let you know, I think some of you are familiar with some of the work that Don King and I and others have done in the area of value. I think in the 1990s we published the statistic that said one librarian saves the equivalent of five people, that is in terms of access time. If people were to do all their own
searches, it would take them that much longer and
that's the librarian's value is to attack that time
people spend trying to find and access information
and the recent Out Sell report indicated that people
are spending more time accessing, so you've got more
of a target to address and to save people time.

There are other ways people save time,
but that's probably the biggest and most obvious
one. And then librarians consistently deliver more
relevant content because we're able to use those
tools more effectively and go to the valid ones and
more efficiently because you're doing it more of the
time whereas people who go occasionally to use
certain resources, they just have to figure it all
out but more efficiently and more effectively than
end users can themselves. And that's been
consistent in every environment that I've ever
looked at.

And then just to give you a sense of
what the kinds of things you can go in, recently did
a return on taxpayer investment study in the State
of Florida, just completed one in the State of
Pennsylvania, came up with very similar results.
Basically a return, an economic return of $6.54 for every dollar invested in public libraries, an annual economic return in Florida of almost 3 billion dollars and new job, a new job outside of a library created for every, just under 6,500 dollars invested in a library simply by virtue of the fact that libraries themselves are purchasing services, employing people that are then using information and providing information to people in education and the workplace and the health service and so on. So, there are studies, certainly I'm not the only person who's done them, there have been many, but that body of knowledge is growing and is being used and is something that as you look at the future, you might want to have some metrics in that arena, metrics of output and outcome that will actually say what contribution you make to, in effect, the value chain for delivery of information content to your user communities. So what will change and what will stay the same? Well the first thing we have to realize is that change and progress aren't the same. We need to be cautious about change. People often say
that when I move to an organization, then things change and I hope really that we're making progress, not just change for the sake of making change.

So, we want to look at progress and to do that you need to have, identify for your organization what progress really means, what would constitute progress as opposed to just reorganizing and restructuring or renaming or whatever.

One of the areas that's changing is this notion of collective intelligence, this collective effort that we see. Tom O'Reilly -- Tim O'Reilly, Tim O'Reilly, actually, said this in, this is the innovation that will most alter the way we live in the future and we see examples of it in Wikipedia at a meeting recently at Arizona State University for where the first time I heard Wikipedia quoted as the definitive source. Never happened before. I mean I know there have been all the arguments about how accurate it is, but somebody stood up and said this is the, this is the definition of informatics, it's in Wikipedia and everybody nodded and said fine.

And then the last speaker of the day
said, yes, that's a very good definition of informatics, I put it up. And suddenly everybody said, ah, you know, slightly different view then. But I thought that was an interesting move forward that this was, you know, brought up by an academic as a definitive source. Amazon, I think Amazon probably has done a lot more than any other sort of collective intelligence site in that we're familiar with, in changing the way we look at how we do things and what's interesting is libraries could have done something similar. I wish libraries had, but Amazon has allowed us to provide these opportunities for user feedback and in a way that most people don't, I guess there are a few people who don't like to have those reminders coming, you've recently bought this, you might like to buy that. But for the most part, I found people are now very accepting of that, that something -- so we've given up a little bit of our private preference information that's used then to feed services back and while any of us might have first have bristled about this, although we're all book
oriented, aren't we, so we probably liked it, we, I find that that line is getting finer. It's a very, there are sometimes I'm willing to allow people to deliver that kind of service to me and there are other times when I say oh, you know, that's getting a little bit close, I don't know that I want somebody monitoring this quite as closely as that. And Flicka, the sharing of photographs, U tube and all those kinds of things where even more silly things are happening and being put up on the Web. Serious things as well, but more inappropriate behaviors on the part of young people I think, and certainly every time -- I have a 16-year-old daughter and every time she and her friends get together, they're watching these movies on Flicka and so on, having a good time. Information and economics. I think information and knowledge will continue to be an economic driver. In addition to existing economic impacts, we'll see new impacts as a result of digitization of more and expanded resources. In other words, the opportunity hasn't fully been extracted yet. We haven't really seen what can
As more and more content is made available, the opportunity to create, if you like, a broader library and information industry around how we make that available is significant. I put in, I see, I see, and this is my view, more of a move to infrastructure over individual systems. That means when we do build systems, we have to make sure that we can get the content in and out, that we can inter-operate, that we can share, that we can share beyond immediate organizational boundaries and that we move somewhat in concert with standard approaches and standards implementation. And then collaboration will become the predominant mode of work. We already collaborate more than we've ever done, certainly librarians are collaborating with people that they don't always see. You're collaborating with people who come in, have an interaction and then you, you deliver them service. If any of you are delivering service 24/7, you are probably delivering to people on other continents as well in ways that you might not have done. But
collaboration is going to purveyed everything we do.

In the academic world we have these

strong disciplinary boundaries and that's our
constraint, okay, everything is optimized towards
the disciplines and the way they've been structured
ever since the early days of the academy. And the
way we've worked around that is to create centers,
inter-disciplinary centers that works well as long
as there's funding for inter-disciplinary centers.
And the problem is when the funding goes, the
centers go because a center created outside of the
mainstream mode of operation of an institution isn't
mainstreamed and, therefore, it has no real
opportunity for sustainability.

NIH is finding this with some of its
translational work, some of its futuristic work,
that the work is good, but it hasn't transformed
anything. And so agencies, funding agencies are now
beginning to look at how they can ensure that more
transformation of organizational structures is going
to occur as a result of the kinds of resources that
they're funding.

So I think generally people would say
yeah, I agree, collaboration is good, multi-disciplinary points of view, perspectives are good, even Meyers Briggs would say that, you know, you need to mix, mix it up a little bit, but there's an overhead to doing that that needs to be acknowledged. And we're going to have to sort of look at how we use resources in a way that allows those kinds of, kinds of collaborations to actually move forward and deliver progress.

So, what's happening in libraries and how are they responding? Well the library is the location of the collection. The physical location of the collection is less relevant in a digital world, okay. I mean you could, a collection could come from anywhere, you can access collections anywhere, so instead of, you know, having to go always into the library, we can access things elsewhere from arrangements made by libraries, if you care who has the copy that they find online. And in the other way it's also more relevant as it does draw people to the physical collection. I think British library found this when they first digitized some of their collection, made
some of their rarer materials available in digitized form via the Web. People now discovered that those resources exist and what happened, visitorship to the British library went up.

So, you know, the very thought that they had originally started with was trying to sort of avoid people coming to, to see the physical things that were pretty rare and, you know, fragile and needed to be kept in certain conditions was drawing people to them. So it has both, because the more, it's like the long tail, right, the more we make available, the more we say it's available, the more we'll identify the long tail, the people out there, the niche markets that we wouldn't otherwise have identified.

But the library still has relevance as place, a very strong relevance. It is a neutral location and just about any environment where you operate and it's an environment you can now come and interact and whether they interact by coming in and using computers, it's away from their normal place and they like to come and they like to interact.
So we've had the discussion on campus as to whether the, oh, I should tell you there's a little bit of a difference. I understand that the undergraduate library is extraordinarily popular among our students. It's open 24 hours a day and it's a place where you can go and you can meet people. So it's a very social place in addition to the fact it's where the undergraduates can go and get their materials related to class. But the undergraduates see the graduate library as a scary place and scary is the word they've used to describe it because it's seen as the serious library, okay, where the real library work goes on.

So what we're trying to find out is where the students going in and using the undergraduate library are going there because they're going, they sort of want to mix and mingle and find a date or whatever, or they're really doing some serious things as well or it's comfortable enough because we've put a lot of technology there that they feel it's like their place and they can go there and do things as well as meet people.

And then how are they going to make the
transition from sort of almost a play-time library
as they would see it into more serious scholarly
resources. It's quite interesting.

So, we're monitoring this in the
academic world, those of you from academe would
probably be familiar with this, but it's, it's just
intriguing. But nevertheless, they're still going
and we're still seeing a lot of traffic to the
graduate library because, of course, our graduate
students are there, the faculty are there, visitors
and researchers from outside come in and use it.

So we haven't seen any reduction in the,
library as place and it's very interesting
because I spent the 1980s here in Washington and
some of you may remember the old video disks that
came out just like this? Well, I received a lot of
questions in those days about whether we actually
needed libraries because wouldn't we be able to
carry the entire collection of the Library of
Congress around in our pocket. That was what I was
asked then. I would say I don't think any time
soon. Go ahead and build your library or your
addition or whatever it is.
We're still not yet seeing a real drop off in, in buildings in all sectors, but I think the role of the library is being thought through as a benefit in organizations, as a place where certain things can occur, particularly individual learning and professional development kinds of learning, as well as other kinds of interactions.

So I think we, we may change the way we design library places, libraries as place, certainly we don't have to have necessarily quite the stack area in the long-term, but I don't think the library as place is actually going to disappear, quite frankly, and we're about to build a new building with a new library, so I feel very strongly about that.

The new information world has to involve, the world we deal with has to involve more than just libraries. It already does, but this is going to be even more the case. We deal with the information industry, we deal with the publishers, but it has to include the other environments where there are people performing functions the same as you do that may or may not be called librarians,
that may or may not have any formal education in
library science.

   In fact, in 1982 I believe there were
ten times more people performing the kind of work
that librarians perform than they were qualified
derreed librarians and we, that's a study that was
done by Tony Devins. And that study is going to be
revisited next year and we're going to get an update
to see how many people are out there performing
purely information-related functions, collection,
organization, retrieval, et cetera, on behalf of a
particular, particular sets of users.

   So hopefully, you know, about a year,
18 months from now we'll have an idea of how much
the functions have grown.

   And then one dilemma we have in the
educational world is to some extent everybody is
becoming somewhat of a librarian. My daughter has
to manage her music downloads on her I-Pod and, you
know, she's always fiddling with them and creating
another, another grouping for a particular set of
friends that she wants to share it with. So she's
constantly classifying and reclassifying in
different ways, to some extent everybody is, because we all do a certain amount of work ourselves.

So the question we have as an academic institution is what does everybody need to know about this field and about the kinds of things that go on in it, what are the issues and what are the concerns and to what extent we have, we focus on professional levels of education and then also doctoral levels of education, because we have that responsibility as well.

So there's an interesting divide now, it used to be, you know, it was clear the librarian performed the work, people came to the library and the librarian provided service.

Now it's not quite so clear. Those boundaries are blurring and we have this indistinction between when people function on their own and when they come to the library. And with all the digital tools we have, while we may see, I think the statistics say librarians are doing a less, a lower proportion of the searches. Well I'm not surprised, because now almost everyone knows how to do some level of searching, how effective it is is
another matter, but everybody can put words into a search engine and get something out, whether they use it or not. But I don't believe we've seen a big drop-off in requests for the librarian to provide help and support and searching support.

So what typically happens is that we've just got a broader community of more informed users who can now begin as they do some of their own searching to understand when they're in trouble, when they're not and can begin to articulate a little bit more clearly, because they have some sense of what a searching engine is looking for or what their needs are.

So the dilemma, I mean the classic dilemma for libraries is that we are responsible for an every accumulating resource, nothing quite ever disappears, this ever-accumulating resource of possible knowledge and that the user dilemma is that they have to define what they don't know so that you can help them find it, okay, or something. I mean they know some of the time, but for most of the time they don't know and how do you define something you don't know. And that's the classic dilemma that we
have both as professional and as user.

So some examples of responses. Bruce talked about the Google initiative, so I'll start there. Google with its many initiatives and its huge resource base, I think is an interesting company to talk to these days as we try and work out where they're going and how they're going to see their long-term future.

But I want to bring to attention the open content alliance as well. Because the open content alliance is, is looking at similar areas, but in a more open way. It's focused not on, it will provide full text of any content that it digitizes, it will provide it back to you, it will provide it to researchers and so on and it allows indexing by anyone who wishes to contribute to indexing. How it will tag that indexing as to who contributed it, I don't know, but it's worth taking a look at I think.

The EU digital library effort is another one that's going on in parallel as their immediate reaction to the Google library announcement, so I think there are several of these mass digitization
efforts that are worth taking a look at.

And as organizations and entities take a look, you should decide which ones meet the kinds of needs that you have, but I think these are discussions that one should engage in sooner rather than later. This is an environment in which you don't want to be behind the curve, you want to be in the curve and not come late so that everything, you know, you no longer are able to move.

And I think the way to move is not necessarily institution by institution, but perhaps through alliances and collectives and cooperatives of institutions, but certainly they are all open right now to having discussions because they're not sure of the future either and I think it's worth being very clear about what you would want to get out of any of these initiatives and how you would want it to work.

So I was heartened to hear Bruce's comments on the discussion and his first reaction to an approach was go away.

I was online one time, just actually had some discussion, I had been to a meeting about the
Google initiatives and talked to the Google people.
I had been meeting with Bruce DeKale, I had been
talking to Bruce DeKale and somebody said hey, this
is the Google initiative, it's X amount per page and
immediately somebody in India said we'll go 50
percent on that. We'll offer it. And I sort of
laughed and I almost said well actually there's
another initiative already, you know, much lower
than that.

So there's some interesting things going
on. How much is warranted, I don't know. Lots of,
lots of rumor out there, but I think it's worth
having serious discussions with these various mass
digitization efforts.

Key issues. The digitization process,
it's expensive, it's labor intensive. We're dealing
with huge, potentially huge volumes of materials.
This is the classic problem of a GPO or a national
archives or whatever.

We really, it's, it's an area where
perhaps we would, as I say, do better collectively
than individually and if we could envision, for now,
just imagine that we're able to digitize as much as
we want, you know, for a reasonable price.

The issue is that physical location of that digital collection can be almost anywhere, right, I mean you'll want to have mirror sites and so, and as Bruce said, plenty of redundancy so you don't lose it, but people no longer have to be co-located with the collection. Even people who are responsible for working with the collection to organize it and index it and make it don't have to be co-located with the collection.

So you've now removed within the long-term constraints of co-location to digital content. That begins to suggest some interesting possibilities and I put it out in one article a number of years ago in the academic library community. Nobody responded. They either didn't read it or they weren't concerned.

But the idea would be supposing we took the collective efforts of the technical services people in libraries and applied them to this massive effort. We might actually stand a chance, but we can't see it because right now most people only think within the bounds of the resources you have
available in your own institution.

And the second thing is if, in fact, we're able to do that and we remove the need to be co-located with the collection to deliver user services, there's an opportunity then for librarians to move out into the user community and work more closely with groups of users and perhaps deliver more tightly-bound services to support the needs of those particular groups and move them in a sort of more proactive way than waiting for people to come for service.

So I put that out as just where I think we could go with this. We're not there because we don't have all the stuff digitized, but it could very much change the way we operate and it is an infrastructural way and the impediments are institutional boundaries, institutional senses of ownership, institutional senses of worth relative to ownership and so on, very complex issues of identity, particularly institutional identity that are going to be very hard to overcome.

So I go back to that list where I had hardware, software, et cetera, the first view of the
technical issues while we still have some challenges
with mass digitization and digital creation and so
on, the real issues are at the people and even more
importantly at the institutional level. That's
where I see the boundaries.

We need new tools. Digitization and
indexing of texts, we're working on manuscripts, by
the way, with the Open Content Alliance. We decided
that they were doing books and books were sort of
pretty well underway, but we're dealing with fragile
manuscripts from southern historical collection to
see how good the scanning technology is in dealing
with those.

We need to be able to reduce costs,
increase efficiency. We need more sophisticated and
automatic indexing of future resources or automated
support, computer-aided indexing of other resources
including audio, visual material, 3-D construction,
amination, data and accompanying meta data as well
as texts. So, the world is much, much more complex
than it has ever been.

Work force issues, we all face
anticipated retirements. It affects every sector.
They are quite significant. People haven't been retiring as quickly as was predicted. Nevertheless, as somebody asked me the other day, I said eventually the people have to retire, they're not going to live forever and then we have a crunch. So the crunch that's been predicted for some time is actually going to be a worse crunch or our ability, particularly our ability as schools to actually, and our capacity to actually deliver enough graduates to fill positions.

So we are, we are working on it. If any of you received a letter from me to fill in a survey and you filled it in, thank you very much. We're doing this work force study for ILMS. We are, the special libraries environment, 6,000 special libraries were surveyed. We're going out to every public library, so if you're in a public library, you will get it at some point. We're going out to every academic library, so you will get it in the Spring and we're going out to 6,000 K through 12 school libraries as well. And we're going out to many other sectors beyond the libraries, but we will be projecting and looking at what's happening, what
kinds of skills are needed and so on.

We are beginning to see the technical skills being important, but since we have an aging issue, we also have an issue in management and leadership. So this higher level skills, getting people from mid-level positions into leadership positions is going to be important as well.

We'll have to be looking at the training and re-training, re-skilling of existing staff and --

(End of Track 6.)

(Beginning of Track 7.)

DR. GRIFFITHS: -- and also the training and recruitment of people with new skill sets. As Bruce said, you brought in people with totally different skill sets, different from the traditional to come in and mix with the traditional and if it can work at GPO, I guess it can work everywhere, so that was also very, very good news. Right.

And I wanted to do a little plug here. At the University of North Carolina, we've seen this coming. We know that we have to re-think and evolve our academic programs, you know, we know what it's
been traditionally and we've done very well as we witness all the graduates in the room, but what is the future of this environment.

And so we created an organization called the knowledge trust which is a, sort of an umbrella organization under which we're conducting a number of different activities and we use that term very carefully, it's actually a service marked name, the knowledge trust. You can go to the knowledge trust, www.theknowledgetrust.org, so the knowledge trust, all one word, org.

And the way we think about it is that really the profession as a whole is responsible for the world's recorded knowledge, okay, that's, you know. It's a very big, ambitious thing, but in a sense we are, we are entrusted with this record of, you know, human activity and accomplishment and creativity and so on. We also see the knowledge trust that the world librarians, archivists, curators, other information professionals who have been entrusted with the care and stewardship of this broad, the world's recorded knowledge, in effect.

And then to get down to brass tacks, it
really is a commitment of the University of North Carolina to look at the development of educational programs for the 21st Century knowledge, information knowledge professionals, librarians, information and knowledge professionals, with the librarianship squarely in the center and celebrated for what its provided, but recognizing that people will be going out into new specialized roles with specialized responsibilities in a broader array of environments. So we're already seeing this, more and more of people with MLS degrees are going into non-library environments and part of our work force study will be looking at where those people are and what they're doing and there's greater demand and in some respects there's a greater opportunity for remuneration in some of those environments. So we have, we feel that it's a responsibility of leadership to actually re-think and think through where we go next, what's the next level at which we need to deliver services and programs. We also wanted to, and a forum within
which we could recognize the value of library --

librarians and information professionals and

celebrate what they do and last week we did have our

first knowledge trust honors ceremony where we

honored some librarians and information

professionals who were doing some very exciting

things and that's all on the Website and so I won't

go into it.

But the third thing very practically,

we're building a new building and same things go on

everywhere and if we're going to build a new

building, we better make sure, because it's going to

be a building, it's going to be our 100 year

building, I'm sure, we had better be sure that we

know what we're going to be before we design the

building. And so we're going through this process

right now, so the whole issue of the future of the

work force is very relevant personally and

institutionally at my institution.

Others are going through it, but that's

one of the reasons we created the knowledge trust.

Copyright and privacy issues. The new

challenges as a result of digitized materials and
challenges to traditional copyright protection, we're seeing this not only in, in traditional materials, but in software as well where we see sort of vacuuming of software patents and the opportunity to challenge both copyright and patent law in that area.

Privacy issues are becoming increasingly complicated. And not every -- and, you know, it's hard to deal with in some respects. You realize that, you know, nothing is private and yet on the other hand, it's still, it's still niggles when that happens. And nowhere will it be more evident than in the medical environment, the health environment. We move towards personalized medicine, and if we move towards towards personalized medicine, then somebody really does have, you're really going to have to protect the information around each individual.

Organizational changes, this is where I think we're going to come to a screeching halt unless we start looking at organizations right now. The digital world does potentially break down traditional boundaries, but in reality it hasn't
happened yet.

We've seen more partnerships, but we haven't seen enough. It requires new types of structures to support new types of collaboration and shared endeavors and like the one I mentioned with the upper atmospheric physicists who have now reorganized the way they conduct their science and because they are sort of focused on that one mission. So if you're very focused mission, mission oriented, it's easier to do than if you're a very diffuse kind of organization like a University.

We live in a moment of history where change is so speeded up that we only begin to see the present when it's already disappearing. That was R.D. Lang wrote that.

And I'll leave you with one quote, "Change has considerable psychological impact on the human mind. To the fearful it's threatening, because it means that things may get worse. To the hopeful, it's encouraging because things may get better and to the confident, it's inspiring because the challenge exists to make things better."

So I think we can all say we know that
the future is going to bring change. How we deal
with that and how we perceive change is very much an
individual thing, but I think for me it's an
exciting environment and there are lots of
opportunities for us to play a proactive role in
helping to construct the kinds of changes that we'd
like to see rather than to react to the kinds of
changes that others might wish to impose upon us.
So I would hope that I would see you
energized and engaged in trying to create the kinds
of changes and the kinds of futures that you think
would work. Thank you very much.

MR. SUDDUTH: Questions from council?
MS. DAVIS: Hi, Jose.

DR. GRIFFITHS: Hi, Denise.

MS. DAVIS: I'm going to give an example
of something that happened and it leads into my
question. I've heard the story a number of times
and many of you may have heard it as well, but a
couple of years ago Florida's State library put on
their Website a number of digital images that they
had and one happened to be an image of Jim Morrison,
the deceased musician when he was at one of the
Florida Universities as a young man.

And when the world found out that that was on their Website, it took out the State of Florida infrastructure for days, not a day, but days and the reason it happened is because the State library controls the infrastructure and they just couldn't deal with the capacity.

They've since resolved that problem, but regardless, State Government came to a halt in Florida as a result of this. And it, as I think about situations like that and although the content is wonderful, I think about communities in the United States that have less than adequate access to the Internet either in terms of speed of access or the technology that sits in their buildings and the technology that sits in the homes of many Americans.

And I guess my question for you is as we, as we consider this, how, how would you suggest that we balance the access to free information?

DR. GRIFFITHS: That's a very good question and it does continue to be a concern.

We have a digital divide in this country even know, even though many of the
telecommunications companies would say we don't. We do. We have areas that are very underserved in terms of connectivity. It's, it's places where even the local public library quantity really get good connectivity and I think that we have to push the notion of everybody deserves equal access to public information.

And I would hope that we could begin, I mean in the way in which the telecommunication companies and the cable companies were able to begin to move their franchises in was by delivering services to certain institutions, to schools, the public library, City Hall, wherever, and not local businesses, but I think we are otherwise going to turn ourselves into, in effect, a very advanced country with third-world areas all around us in our country and, you know, it, the precursor to an infrastructure approach is that the infrastructure exists in the same way everywhere.

So maybe we need something similar to the rural electrification project for telecom and to push in that area. But it is a problem and it's the same problem that other countries have had when
first of all only the capital city was connected and only the main University in the capital city and so on.

So, if in fact we're going to move increasingly to a digital environment, then that's got to be a precursor that that level of infrastructure exists and we're going to have to make it clear that the cost of doing so is worth bearing. And that's hard, I realize, at a time when, you know, train service doesn't go anywhere, you know, it only goes to some places, it does go somewhere, but not everywhere and other kinds of infrastructural services have been left to the individual municipality, individual household and so on.

It's a concern. There's a tremendous amount of infrastructure, however, that does exist. You know, traffic lights, fiber optics traffic lights, for example, that's very underutilized and could carry traffic so that there are structures, but it's again getting across the institutional organizational boundaries to take advantage of it.
MR. AKEROYD: Jose, you've spent a lot of time talking and emphasizing digitization and I, I remember in the late '80s, in the early '90s many of us were concerned a lot about the slow fires phenomenon in dealing with preservation of paper materials. And all of a sudden that's disappeared from the landscape. Everybody is focused now on digitization projects. We're doing it, I think just about everybody here is doing it to some degree or another.

And I wonder about your perspective on, is digitization, that it's a technology that kind of overwhelmed or took over the awareness of the need for dealing with the slow fires phenomenon and I wonder is that going to happen, too, are there technologies out there in the offing that are going to trump this one and are we all of a sudden, before we solve one problem, you know, what's the next one and are we going to get consumed by that as well?

DR. GRIFFITHS: Well, I think there's always going to be another one coming and I do think that we, we didn't solve the last problem and we're actually moving further away from being able to
solve the present one.

So, you know, I talk sometimes and I mean, you know, and say we're, you know, we are losing our memory, I mean America is losing its memory and our ability to keep things for the long-term and because it's easy to, so many things are now born digital and it's such a mismatch that we aren't really spending the time and effort to sort out what's really worth keeping and what isn't worth keeping.

And we see that already, you know, when a University, well, when Bruce James retires or the University president retires, the archives of those people are no longer quite as structured, as neatly organized and people don't really know how to deal with them. We look at Websites that disappear all the time, I mean Web links. And so we don't have a very secure environment. We have a very fragile digital environment and from an information content perspective, that's, that's not good.

So I worry about the fact that I see, well at the University of Michigan, I'll use a personal example, when I went there, I discovered
that the whole University of Michigan computing environment was run out of a building that had residential power, that had a roof that, a roof that leaked, that were run on servers underneath peoples' desks and were run by people who, you know, sort of wanted to fiddle around.

The production environment and the development environment were running on the same servers and it took me two and a half years to rest those servers away from the developers and put it into an appropriate environment.

So I worry that we think we've solved the problem, I mean we don't think it, but others think the problem is solved. Others think the problem of dissemination is solved because it's on the Web. It's on the Web today, it may not be on the Web tomorrow.

So we have to sort of think through some of the traditional environments. We learned a lot during the 1990s from the main-framers who knew how to run a very stable, secure environment that worked well and we need to take those kinds of lessons and understand what it is to operate a robust digital
information environment before we really think that we're even close to dealing with the problem. But the even bigger problem that's coming are all these devices that are collecting input everywhere that we may not be aware of.

I mean I gave a talk at SLA and I discovered I don't know how many people in the room were recording the talk. And first my reaction was oh, you know, nobody asked me, but then it was just individuals doing it, you know, and the number of times we must each have been photographed by people or been caught in the background of somebody's photographs or video cameras, I mean it's out there.

And so the question I think for the profession is how can we ensure that we don't, we, we sort of have to say where the, where the formal information is, where the validated information content is and that's what we'll build and continue that trust so that as trust is the biggest thing we have to offer, I think, and the tools and know-how to say what's valid, what's relevant, what's authentic, what's accurate, what's up to date is the value that we deliver to the user communities, with
services built on that.

But if we don't have that content validated, then our services -- we're building services on a weak infrastructure. And so I do think that technology will keep coming and it's the, it's the dilemma of the librarian that has to deal with every format you know that's ever been and try to inter-operate from one to another.

MR. HEMPHILL: Dr. Griffiths, this is Pete Hemphill.

To what degree do you think the educational infrastructure is keeping up with the cyber infrastructure?

DR. GRIFFITHS: Well, coming from an institution that is about to change everything from the ground up because we have out-molded everything and we have systems that are almost older than I am, we're not. It's, in the same way we don't have very secure environments. We don't have very robust environments because we've been very open, we're very distributed. It's very hard to maintain a very robust environment in there, but what we do have is a lot of people who have played with and moved the
technology forward a bit, so what we do have is a lab environment, if you'd like to take the whole institution, I don't mean a single lab, the institution is a lab to try things out and see how it works.

But we, ourselves, are investing a lot of resources in creating the environments of the future and trying to demonstrate what that would be and as, I mean you know from a personal point of view as we look at a new building, we're going to have to look very carefully at what kind of lab our building is going to be.

I mean it's a living lab of some kind, but what do we want to portray, not only for the students who come, but for the profession who might wish to come and visit.

So I think we have a responsibility there as well to model a future.

MR. HEMPHILL: Well, I think what Council is hoping is that you could take the vision document that was produced and people take that back to their institutions as a guideline of what Council, anyway, sees happening in the 21st Century
to help drive the academic institutions to help keep up with the cyber infrastructure.

DR. GRIFFITHS: Yeah, I mean it's a critical part of our future. I would hope that we can ensure, that, ensure that all the schools move forward in a similar way and we're certainly talking with each other about our need to move forward and keep delivering people with appropriate skills and giving you an environment in which you can come back and refresh your skills. And certainly it's recognized in a number of the larger schools who have more resources because they do more research that that's, that that's the future that they have to create.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other questions from Council?

We have a couple of minutes, any question or two from the audience? If not, thank you very much.

DR. GRIFFITHS: Thank you.

(Appause.)

MRS. RUSSELL: I think that concludes our sessions for today. We'll start in the morning with
coffee out in the foyer at 8 a.m. and the first session
will be back in this room at 8:30 a.m. tomorrow morning,
so have a nice evening and we'll see you in the
morning.

(End of October 22nd, 2006, Meeting.)
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MR. SUDDUTH: Okay, I hope everybody had
a good evening and we'll get started this morning.

I want to wait just a couple of minutes while we get some other, the rest of the people in here and while we're waiting for that, I want to make a couple of announcements.

Again, a reminder, lunch today is lunch with your regional. Your regional should have contacted you beforehand or posted notes out on the bulletin board outside. If you want hand notes and have me make announcements like DC, Delaware and Maryland libraries will be having lunch at the Capital City Brew Company at 12:15 pm.

As I said, I can make announcements after the break as long as we don't get too many of them up here.

Another thing is regarding the tours on Wednesday, it had been mentioned that you could still sign up. No, you can't sign up for those tours. Because of security clearances, you had to sign up before you got to DC, so if, if that's causing a problem, then get with one of the GPO staff and let them know, but it was mentioned in one meeting that you could still register for tours and
you, that was an error, so. And I won't mention who said that.

It weren't me, though. But it's hard to, you know, it's all a security thing.

Okay. Usually what we do on Monday morning before we get our, the update from GPO, SUDOCs and all that is we do a little council aerobics. And I don't feel so bad about it this morning because of all that cake that everybody has ingested, so it's going to be good for you to get the sugar through your system so you don't crash in about an hour.

So, let's start with geography, who here is from west of the Mississippi, stand. Stand up, that's what the aerobic part is. Welcome.

And as you are sitting down, the rest of you can stand up and say that you're east of the Mississippi, unless you're from the Pacific, okay.

All right. I'm going to go a little quicker now, public libraries, okay. And State libraries. Very good. Academic libraries. Okay. Law libraries. I do that to see how many go up and down. And any other libraries, special libraries.
See, we have to do that.

And I think this is a question that I don't remember, I think Dan Barkley started it and I like it and we've asked it every year, I like asking it, how many of you have full support from your library to attend? Wow, very good. I'm jealous.

Some support? Okay. And those diehard dedicated who are doing this all on your own.

Thank you, Dan. And others.

Okay. Let's see, we've done aerobics.

Again, if you haven't met GPO staff, I'd like the GPO staff to stand and look around and if you have not met them all, take the time and meet them all because they all each have something that they can help you with, and this is a good time and one of the important networking things that you can do while you're here.

All right. And, let's see, today we have, this morning's session is an update from GPO, Superintendent of Documents and Operations. After the break this morning we'll have the update from Program Management Office, including Mike Wash, master integrator, and that's I think going to be
kind of a panel presentation.

And so let's get started with that and we're going to start with Judy.

MRS. RUSSELL: Thank you, Bill.

Well good morning everyone. Can you hear me? Let's see if I can slide this computer out of the way so I have someplace to put down my papers here. No, fine, it will be fine.

Well, good morning and welcome. I'm really pleased to join Bill in welcoming you once again to our nation's capital and to the 69th meeting of the Depository Library Council. That's a lot of meetings we've had, isn't it.

I'm really delighted that so many of you have made the effort to be here. As of Friday, we had over 490 people registered for the meeting and then we had 30 on-site registrations yesterday. I assume we'll have some more today, so we have a really excellent turn-out and based on these aerobics, we have a good representation of library types and sizes in different parts of the country. So I think we are grateful that you've all taken the time to come and be with us.
I say this every time, but I'm no less sincere in saying it that I am very conscious that even with this large a turn-out, that many of our colleagues were not able to be here and that I urge you to take the information that you gather here home from the conference and share it with others in your institution and in your community. It's very important that we engage the entire depository library community and in fact the entire library community in these discussions since other libraries throughout the country rely on depository collections and services.

Many of the libraries that can't come are the very ones who most need this information because they aren't able to get to the national meetings, so you all have a charge when you go home to find a few people who were not here and inform them about what you learn.

We will be posting the GPO update, the presentations and other hand-outs and we are recording these sessions so that we can make them available as pod casts, but your permanent engagement will be the most important means of
making sure that we are communicating effectively
about the issues and ideas that are discussed here.
People just really remember and relate to things
much better when it's an in-person thing, so much
better when it's an in-person communication.

We've already heard from Bruce about the
progress that GPO has made in a whole range of
things, including its initiatives related to public
access to Federal information and we've been
enlightened by Carol Tullo's description of how the
U.S. unlocking the potential of public sector
information. I found it very interesting the
parallels that were there as I'm sure you did.

But not surprising. We've been
challenged by Jose Marie Griffiths to, in her
remarks on the cyber infrastructure and the future
roles of libraries in that new environment and I
think all three speakers have given us a lot to
think about. And I'm sure that many of the ideas
that they touched on yesterday will be part of our
dialogue over the next few days and that these
themes will be repeating.

We've also had the opportunity to
celebrate the accomplishments of our newest Federal depository library of the year. For those of you that were not here yesterday, I would like to announce that the Benton Harbor Public Library was chosen this year for this honor and I want you to join me in a minute again in congratulating Fred Kirby and Jill Rauh on their excellent job that they are doing. The Benton Harbor Public Library really exemplifies the real contribution that a depository library with minimal resources and considerable dedication can make in a community.

And I want to read you just one statement from the nomination because I think it's very telling and the statement is that in not asking what source might be useful but what Government source might be useful the library ensures that Federal Government resources are used to their full potential to help the local community.

And I often say that people come into the library looking for information but they don't necessarily know that they need Government information, so that attitude of trying to be sure that they think about whether Government information
can help that user is a very important part of why we have this program and why it works.

So please join me in congratulating Fred and Jill again for their excellent work.

(Applause).

With me this morning is Ric Davis who's the Director of Library Services and Content Management. He's going to give you an update on major projects that support the FDLP and the cataloging and indexing program. He will be followed by Bob Tapella, who is GPO's Chief of Staff. Bob's going to give you an update on key initiatives from other parts of GPO.

And as always, we have a full agenda, so you have lots of choices in addition to the council sessions, there are agency updates, GPO operational open forums and a variety of other educational programs. There are also some of the excellent tours on Wednesday that Bill mentioned.

And first-time attendees are reminded that council is an advisory body and as such, its purpose is to advise the Public Printer and the Superintendent of Documents. This is done primarily
through the dialogue that you're going to observe
during the council sessions.

   And that's why you saw if you were here
yesterday that Bill will first call on council for
questions and comments before turning to the
audience. We always reserve a portion of the time
in each session for audience participation and we
provide a variety of other means for members of the
community to share their points of view with GPO and
the council members during the breaks and other
times. We really welcome that input and we actively
seek it, but it is the council sessions are meetings
of an advisory body and should be understood as

This is my eighth and final meeting with
the council as Superintendent of Documents. Bruce
and I have met with the council in Reno, St. Louis,
Albuquerque and Seattle and four times here in
Washington, although I was only here in spirit last
year because my mother was in the hospital.

   These meetings have been important
milestones in my tenure as Superintendent of
Documents providing an opportunity to assess our
progress, discuss our options, debate the issues and set a course of action.

There were 15 individuals already serving on the council when I became the Superintendent of Documents and four additional classes have been appointed including the one that begins their service with this meeting, although we've actually been putting them to work since the Seattle meeting, so they've been well indoctrinated already.

These 35 individuals have invested their time, their energy and their expertise in a dialogue with GPO and the depository community on the future roles of GPO and the Federal depository libraries and public access to Government information.

I would like to ask the council members who have served with me who are in the audience to stand and then I would like you all to join me in expressing our thanks to the ones here and in the audience who have worked with us in the past four years. So can we have some people stand in here.

(Applause)

The primary theme in all of these
meetings and in many other meetings that I have participated in since becoming Superintendent of Documents has been planning for the future and this council meeting will be no exception.

During the next few days we'll continue the exploration of issues and opportunities that we must address to make sure that the Federal Depository Program is as vital to the nation in the next 100 years as it has been for the past 200 years. Our common goal throughout this dialogue has been to reaffirm the important mission of the Federal Depository Library Program and to seek to ensure that there needs to be a viable and vital program for permanent public access that acknowledges and utilizes new technologies to support democracy and inform our users.

We continue to build on the foundation of common principles, acknowledging that the Federal Government has the obligation to disseminate and provide broad public access to its public information as well as to guarantee the authenticity and integrity of that information, and furthermore, that the Government has an obligation to preserve
its information and assure permanent public access,
not just contemporary public access.

Our common vision is to serve the public
by increasing access to and usefulness of published
Federal information, to provide not just information
but as the cartoon that's going to pop up here in a
second, I hope, hmm, well, there it is. As this
cartoon shows, clarification.

I saw this cartoon at the ARL meeting
last week, but others have used it as well as a

humorous way to emphasize the role of the library
and its expert staff to assist users who frequently
find good enough information through Google and
other search engines, but often need the expertise
of our library staff to make that information
meaningful and useful when it really matters.

And that's been a lot of our discussion
over these past years, is how to shift our focus
more to service to those users and less to the
collections that we manage, not that the collections
are not important, but that increasingly those
users, even when they don't know it, need our
assistance and our clarification.
In the future even more than it does today the public is going to insist upon timely, continuous, permanent no fee access to published information from its Government. The public will rely on deposit libraries for services that facilitate the informed use of published information in all available formats and to provide access to the tangible collections and the public will expect 24-7 access to a comprehensive collection of online published information. The future digital system that's now under development will ensure that such a collection curated and published Federal information. The future digital system that's now under development will ensure that such a collection curated and authenticated by GPO is available for permanent public access.

During the next session, Mike Wash, our Chief Technical Officer, will update you on our progress in the development of this world-class system to ingest, manage, deliver and preserve digital content. It's an enormously important part of our future.

By law and by tradition, the Federal
Depository Library Program has the mission to provide for perpetual, free and ready public access to the printed and electronic documents and other published information products of the Federal Government through the partnership between GPO and our participating libraries.

I want to paraphrase GPO's strategic vision and say that while this mission will remain essentially the same in the future, the introduction of digital technology has changed the ways that Government information products and services will be created and how they will look and function to meet the ever-changing needs of the Federal Government itself and the way the public users of Government information now prefer to access and use it. And I think Jose's remarks yesterday were helpful also in looking at our program in that broader context of how libraries overall are changing to perform for the users in the cyber infrastructure.

It's the re-focusing of the Federal Depository Library Program to meet the changing requirements for access to published information of the Federal Government that we continue to address.
as a community.

We've made significant progress in the past four years, not only has GPO issued its strategic vision for the 21st Century, but together we've reviewed and discussed dozens, sometimes it seems like thousands of briefing papers and white papers on a variety of topics of importance to our future.

Tomorrow morning the council will conduct a session on its vision document culminating over 18 months of work by council members and others in the community. It's been a labor of love and an enormous effort to pull together all the threads of this complex and rapidly changing environment and they are to be commended for their efforts.

This document will be an important part of the foundation as we continue to work together to design, build and manage the Federal Depository Library Program of the future. As always, we have a lot to cover in the next two and a half days and I'm looking forward to some lively and informative discussions.

Many of these topics will continue to be
on the agenda for the spring meeting in Denver which is scheduled for April 15th to 18th and I hope that many of you will be able to attend that meeting as well.

There may be a new Superintendent of Documents with you in Denver, but whether or not my successor is in place, Ric and his very capable staff are well prepared to continue our progress on the near term initiatives that are already planned or underway as well as to continue the dialogue with council and the community to determine what else needs to be done to ensure the future of permanent public access to Government information.

With that I'm going to turn the microphone over to Ric. We'll take your questions and comments after Ric and Bob complete their presentations.

Thank you very much for your attention this morning and for your participation during the next few days and especially for your support and assistance during the past four years.

(Applause)

MR. DAVIS: Good morning everyone. I
first want to take the opportunity to welcome all of you to this year's Fall Depository Library Council meeting. It's really good to always see familiar faces and also a lot of new ones out in the audiences. I am Ric Davis and I'm the Director of the Library Services and Content Management group at GPO. I'm entering my 15th year of Government service and I'm very fortunate that most of that time has been spent working with all of you on FDLP issues.

As you know, the Federal Depository Library Program is integral to keeping the American public informed about their Government and I want to commend all of you for your work and dedication for this service.

There are a lot of exciting initiatives underway in library services and content management and I'd like to share some of those with you today. I encourage you to take this information as well as the handout that's available in your packets and share it with those in the library community as well.

As many of you know, we recently went
through an extensive reorganization at GPO and I'm pleased to say that we've now filled out all 12 of our senior managerial positions and other staff positions in library services and content management. We have several positions still to fill, particularly in our Web content area, but by and large the reorganization is completed.

In addition to the reorganization, we've also taken a very innovative and disciplined approach to project management. We've spent a significant amount of time reviewing all of our initiatives and applying the principles of project management to them.

Each project is now examined clearly in terms of the stakeholders, the objectives, the scopes, the resources and for each new initiative, scope statements, project charters, risk management plans and communication plans are carefully developed and our staff members monitor the progress of these initiatives by following and modifying these plans.

The project management approach helps us better monitor our progress with each initiative,
discover potential problems early on and stay on track with project goals. This approach is also assisting us as we collaborate with all of you and our library partners, other Federal agencies and business units at GPO.

Before I begin to address specific initiatives within library services and content management, I'd like to remind everyone that the GPO operational forums will be held tomorrow. The first one will be at 8:30 a.m. and the second will be at 3:30 p.m.

These sessions will give you an opportunity to ask specific technical and operational questions related to the FDLP and our services. In the past we've typically only done one of these sessions at conference, but each time we do one, we have standing room only and people are actually out the door, so we've added on another session this time.

In referring to another session of note, GPO is working to devise a data migration strategy to ensure that the content of the CD ROMs that we've distributed to depository libraries remains
accessible for the future. There will be a session on CD Rom data migration this afternoon at 3:30 p.m., a panel will present information on projects to ensure continued access to content of CD ROMs underway in several depository libraries.

Now I'd like to say a few words about some specific initiatives beyond what's in your hand-outs.

We've assembled a cross agency team at GPO to collaborate on a re-design of the FDLP desktop, GPO Access and GPO.gov. This is part of a large-scale effort to improve the functionality and user friendliness of all of our GPO online services. This team is working together to modify GPO's existing services so that they are as intuitive as possible.

Adam's GPO online services open forum at 10:30 a.m., an FDLP desktop re-design will be demonstrated for you as well as a re-design of the browse topics feature on GPO Access. The desktop re-design was developed in an effort to improve the ease of use and functionality of the current site and we look forward to collecting your thoughts and
impressions of the re-design. The browse topics re-design continues GPO's and Oklahoma State University's successful partnership to create topical path finders to electronic Federal Government information. The new and improved browse topics includes an updated list grouped by subject and allows users to search by key word across all topics.

Regarding our efforts to more fully develop a disaster recovery site at GPO, GPO has awarded a contract in the past two weeks to Creative Information Technology to forward GPO accessed data to the disaster recovery solution. The critical feature of this contract is that it will migrate applications to a consistent data set building on the disaster recovery plan we already have in place.

Not only are we working on various GPO Access upgrades, we are also working to improve the way we collect and compile statistics. Bruce talked about that, but we are also working to improve the way we collect and compile statistics. Bruce talked about that a little bit yesterday in his speech and I'd like to talk a little bit more.
A working group has been developed in the library unit and weekly meetings are held for the discussion of implementation issues and updates. Team members have been assigned defining terms and metrics calculations and a reporting mechanism has been developed. Additionally, a database has been developed to capture metrics and statistical data is being captured from each unit. We plan to make these metrics reports publicly available and hope to release them very soon.

You may also have noticed a large number of boxes coming in lately from our depository distribution unit. I'm pleased to say that we're completely caught up on the backlog that had existed of what needed to be distributed. We are also in the process of bringing in four additional staff members who are currently out at our Laurel warehouse facility to help with operations and we're in the process of backfilling one of our key critical positions in the Distribution Operation.

We've also made some exciting progress in our digitization demonstration project. You
heard a little bit about that from Bruce yesterday, as well. GPO is currently conducting a demonstration project for the digitization of legacy publications, priorities for digitization include legislative and regulatory material that expands the coverage of the most popular GPO Access databases.

We will conduct evaluations of this work that is being done by our digital media services group at GPO based on standards set by the library unit in coordination with the library community. This will be done in December and we'll subsequently share the results. The key objective of this is to validate our digitization specifications and demonstrate quality, accessibility and permanence of content based on those specifications.

Library Services and Content Management have also participated in a number of outreach efforts of note. I want to mention this morning. Robin Haun-Mohamed is not with us this morning, but recently Robin presented on the International Conference on the preservation of digital objects at Cornell University. She, along with Gil Baldwin from the chief technical officer's organization,
spoke on the preservation of Federal digital publications staff and our planning and development group also attended the first meeting of the Great Western Librarian Association and the Center for Research Libraries Federal technical reports task force held in Chicago.

The task force is conducting a pilot project to digitize and provide access to Federal technical reports. GPO was asked to share information on both our digitization demonstration project as well as our cataloging efforts.

Library Technical Information Services have also given several presentations on the catalog of Government publications and also the integrated library system. Something that's very important to me that I hope many of you have had a chance to look at already is in relation to our outreach on a new distance learning tool that's on the horizon. GPO recently conducted a test of a live online training session using OPAL, O-P-A-L, which stands for Online Programming for All Libraries. OPAL is an international collaborative effort by libraries of all types to provide Web-based programs and training.
for library users and library staff members.

A number of librarians participated in the staff and GPO staff are evaluating the group's comments and suggestions to engage in further collaboration with all of you as we make decisions about Web-based training tools and modules for the future.

The value of such a tool would be enabling depository staff and others to participate in educational events which they could not otherwise attend either during the live session or later using training archives.

Events under consideration in the future include Depository Library Conferences for those who can't attend as well as our annual Inter-agency Seminar. Also relating to outreach, GPO extended its partnership with Case Western Reserve University and the Census Bureau through 2011. This partnership ensures that electronic information products from the 2000 Census of Population and Housing are permanently accessible under the FDLP.

Many of you have recently inquired about the status of our Federal Depository Library
handbook. Work is continuing in chapters on GPO organization, public services, preservation, housing, staffing, partnerships and also disaster recovery were posted for comment on the FDLP desktop.

GPO staff are currently reviewing the comments from these and final chapters are being completed. Additional chapters including regional services and Federal libraries will be posted for comment in the near future.

Next I wanted to briefly update everyone on GPO's pilot project on the automatic harvest of information from the Environmental Protection Agency. This was a collaborative effort between the Chief Technical Officers organization and Library Services and Content Management along with EPA and two vendors.

Our goal for the pilot was to learn about available technologies and methodologies for automated Web discovery, harvesting and assessment of U.S. Government publications. The pilot recently concluded and we are very pleased with the amount of knowledge and experience that was gained based on
our explanation of the characteristics and parameters of online scope in scope publications, rules were established that first identified publications and then we evaluated them to determine if the EPA publications were in scope of the FDLP. Accuracy in identifying these in scope publications improved greatly between the first, the second and the last crawl that we did of the EPA Website. We have numerous ideas on how to improve the accuracy rate and will continue to investigate automated harvesting in the future. There's also a council session this afternoon at 1:30 p.m. on this to go into more detail and I encourage you to attend that. Regarding our integrated library system, as you know, we released the first release of this back in March and we're near release on more significant enhancements. There are two parts to these enhancements, one for new titles and one for new electronic titles. These both provide dynamic pre-defined searches to retrieve newly-catalogued titles by specific time periods. The library directory is also under development, which is part of the --
MR. DAVIS: -- locate libraries administrative module. This will allow libraries to input and edit their depository library information. Libraries in the public will also be able to search directory information and this also includes the implementation of MetaLib or federated searching capabilities.

I want to thank you all for your time and attention today and again encourage you to attend as many of our educational programs as possible.

I will now turn it over to Bob Tapella, our Chief of Staff.

MR. TAPELLA: Good morning. Yesterday Bruce -- well let me begin, I'm Bob Tapella, GPO Chief of Staff.

Yesterday Bruce spoke briefly about the fact that the vitality of GPO is absolutely critical to the vitality of the Federal Depository Library Program. And I'm pleased to report this morning, although my CFO will not allow me to give actual
numbers, that GPO has entered its third straight year of profitability and the trend line is going well. And what that means is that we will have investment capital going forward and as Bruce also mentioned yesterday, it is GPO that is funding the future digital system thus far.

Congress was nice enough to allow us to use prior year funds, but those are retained earnings because GPO has been improving its efficiency. And as we are talking about the future, Bruce also mentioned yesterday the planning and strategy board and that is a group of sort of our second tier of senior executives, it's mostly deputies. It is chaired by Mike Wash, surprisingly enough, and that planning and strategy board is not only responsible for making decisions and recommendations on where GPO invests its capital, it also is responsible and has been now, we're going into our third year, of having a budget for GPO which our managers must manage within.

This year, and we're now, what, two weeks into the fiscal year, the budget for GPO this year is 888 million dollars and of that about
15 percent comes from direct appropriations.
What some folks don't realize and right now we're under a continuing resolution and Congress has not yet made final decisions on budgets, they're going to be coming back in a lame duck session beginning November 13th and at risk for us is not only our S&E appropriation and our Congressional printing and binding fund, but our customers are Federal agencies and while we have a very aggressive schedule for our budget of 888 million dollars, that's dependent on our customers buying our products and services.
And under a continuing resolution, Jim Bradley, who runs our customer services agency or department, is very concerned that other agencies may cut out some of their printing and binding. You know they say travel first -- is the first thing to be cut, training is number two, printing is number three. We're not in a crisis mode yet, but I think it's very important for all of you to think about the budget impacts for GPO. Even though only a small portion of our direct -- or a small portion of our actual budget comes from direct
appropriations, now that's kind of the bad news.

The good news side is as I spoke with you in Seattle, FedEx, Kinko's contract, GPO Express is going gang-busters. We are not yet at the volume levels that we had hoped at this point in the project, but the trend line is just going the right direction. And what we are finding is that agencies are finding it to be a convenient and very helpful service offering and in fact last year -- excuse me, last week FEMA announced at a press release at how important the GPO Express program is to them in meeting their current challenges and have talked about the amount of money that they've saved by using the GPO Express program over the last six months. And I think as I spoke in Seattle, this is going to be absolutely critical for all of our small jobs that we're currently processing for our Federal agencies.

The second area that I'd like to talk about is an area called security and intelligent documents. Now that in the strategic vision, we talk about the fact that we anticipate within the next five to seven years that half of all GPO
revenue could be coming out of security and
intelligent documents. That area produces the
United States Passport and we are working with the
State Department in collaboration on rolling out the
first electronic passports. And that's really what
an intelligent document it is. It is a paper
document that has an electronic chip in it to make
the document either more secure or more usable.

As part of that process, we are
significantly expanding the amount of investment
that we're making in security and intelligent
documents. We are, I believe this month we will hit
a 200,000 mark for the number of electronic

As we are moving in that business, we're
also looking at things such as Government ID cards
which are both printed and electronic and I think I
announced at an earlier meeting, and I don't
remember which one, that T.C. Evans, when he left
the superintendent of documents operation, came to
work for the chief of staff's office doing strategic
initiatives. He is now leading one of our efforts
in what's called HSPD 12, Homeland Security
Presidential Directive Number 12, which are the
inter-operable Government ID cards and he just
started that assignment a couple weeks ago and it
could be another one of our significant growth
businesses for GPO.

As we move forward as well, we have PKI
and that's very important to Mike Wash and our
future digital system. It's also a significant
business opportunity for GPO and that is moving
along full steam ahead and we are working on some
pilot programs in that arena and we're very excited.

You know, it was, it was a little
over -- a little under four years ago that Judy
Russell entered GPO for I guess the second time and
I was fortunate enough to have an office next to
hers. And since Judy and I have similar work habits
and tend to be there late into the evening, we would
regularly see each other and would ponder the
future.
And she'd always keep her door when she
was working late open to the hallway and I'd
regularly wander in and we'd talk about just where
GPO is going, both in general terms as well as where
she wanted to lead the Federal Depository Library
Program.
And one of the things we talked about
was, you know, does Title 44 need to be reformed.
And we both came to a conclusion that, yeah, it
probably does, but at the end of the day, is that
where we want to spend our effort.
And Judy make a proclamation in the
early days that what was probably the most vital
ing the work she was doing was building
partnerships and relationships with two other
branches of Government, with the individual
agencies. And she said, you know, it's really not
about the law, it's about GPO being able to talk to
our sister agencies, explain the importance and the
vitality of the program and convince them that, yes,
they ought to play with us.
And it's sort of, I use that as a slight
introduction to the person that I'm going to be
introducing next and this individual actually has a
background in security documents and imaging
systems. Her name is Ellen Herbst and for those of
you that don't know Ellen, Ellen is the Director of
the National Technical Information Service under the
Department of Commerce and Ellen's been on the job a
little over a year and has been meeting with GPO
regularly during that past year. And I'd like to
bring Ellen up right now because she'd like to make
an announcement.

MS. HERBST: Good morning. Thanks, Bob,
for that introduction and thanks to all of GPO for
this opportunity to speak to you and especially Judy
Russell who we've been working with.

It's a pleasure to be here at my first
depository library conference where all the possible
ways to access our Government's information are
being shared and discussed and this morning I want
to add the National Technical Information Service to
this discussion.

The mission of NTIS as part of the
Department of Commerce's Technology Administration
is to support the nation's economic growth and job
creation by providing access to information that
stimulates innovation and discovery. This is
accomplished through two major programs. The first
is information and collection and dissemination to
the public and the second is services for Federal
agencies.

In support of its mission, NTIS
maintains a permanent collection of approximately
3 million scientific and technical reports that are
produced by or for Government agencies and that are
useful to U.S. business and industry.

Many of these resources have not in the
past been made available through the Federal
Depository Library Program. Now the responsibility
for providing this content to the depository
libraries lies with the publishing agency and not
with NTIS as an aggregator. NTIS is exempt from
FDLP obligations by the provisions of Title 44,
United States Code, Section 1903 because its
products and services, and here I quote, must
necessarily be sold in order to be self-sustaining.

NTIS receives no appropriations and must
recover all of its costs from sales. Nevertheless,
I'm here today in the spirit of our mission and the
mission of the FDLP to tell you that NTIS is
interested in exploring how it can participate in
the depository program by providing access to its
electronic content.

Now unfortunately we cannot --
(Applause).

Thank you. Thanks.

Unfortunately we can't provide access to
print or microfiche products free of charge because
of our statutory mandate to be self-sustaining;
however, NTIS wants to work with GPO to provide the
FDLP with access to as comprehensive as possible a
collection of published Federal information.

As a first step, we are working with GPO
to identify what NTIS content is not already
accessible to depository libraries and to ascertain
the percentage of overlap between our collections.

Once this is determined, a pilot project
will be initiated to provide depository libraries
access to NTIS electronic content. Now while the
technical details of the pilot are not worked out,
we want the pilot to focus on a couple of areas and accomplish a few things.

First, to include all depository libraries as participants during the pilot. We'd like to be ready to implement in January of 2007. We believe the pilot should last for 6 to 12 months and will use a subset of records in the NTIS database.

The pilot will provide access to bibliographic records and abstracts, when they exist, for a fixed period of time, perhaps the most recent three to five years and provide access to those records that contain links to full text online content. And we believe the pilot should focus on what we call the PB collection. PB is an acronym for Publications Board that was used by the predecessor agency to NTIS and is still used today to indicate reports that NTIS has added to its collection on behalf of Federal agencies.

The focus of this pilot is on the PB collection because it is estimated that this material which represents approximately one-third of the NTIS collection is most likely to contain
content not currently available to depository libraries. The other two-thirds of the NTIS collection contain publications from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Energy and the Defense Technical Information Center, which are already available through the FDLP.

During the pilot, information will be gathered and reviewed, including any impact on the financial stability of NTIS. Some adjustments may have to be made in the pilot if a negative financial impact is realized since we cannot undermine the financial stability of NTIS.

NTIS and GPO both expect that the pilot will validate the assumption that NTIS can participate in the FDLP with its electronic content without suffering an economic loss that would violate its legal requirements.

Now I would very much like to hear the thoughts and ideas of this community on how best to approach this pilot and I will be around for a good part of the meeting and welcome your input.

Thank you very much.
MS. RUSSELL: Somehow I knew you were going to be pleased about that announcement. Thank you very much, Ellen.

Bill, do you want to start our question and answer period for us?

MR. SUDDUTH: Council?

Are there questions from council?

MR. WARNICK: Well I'll, is this working? Yes. Ellen, yes, that's a very welcomed announcement, thank you.

The, of course NTIS has a very, very difficult business plan because unlike any other information operations in the Government of which I'm aware of, there's no Congressional appropriation and the partnership with GPO has to be self-sustaining I guess in that light.

So is, is there a business plan, any ideas about how NTIS is going to return money to itself by this collaboration? Or is that something yet to be worked out?

MS. HERBST: Thanks, Walt, you always ask the interesting questions.

As Walt mentioned, there is no
appropriation base for NTIS and most of our
funding -- all of our funding comes from two
sources. One is the sale of information, mainly in
physical media form, paper, fiche, CDs, et cetera,
although there are subscription products as well
that are electronically based. And the other source
of funding for NTIS is the work we do for other
Federal agencies, mainly doing things like Webifying
their information dissemination and helping them in
other ways with dissemination.

There's been no discussion whatsoever
between GPO and NTIS of any money issue because I
think what's driving NTIS is a belief that getting
our electronic content out and exposed in more
venues is both helpful to everyone's mission and
will also in the long-term help sustain the NTIS
mission.

Now, the pilot is designed to test that
theory and that's why we need to focus on the
electronic content initially, since that's the
lowest cost form of dissemination we have.

MR. SWINDELLS: This is sort of a side
issue and I've never understood why you don't make
because it would seem to promote people actually buying your materials and that's one of the things that I know has been a constant to the depository community, simply to have the full index, not just the last few years.

MS. HERBST: Right, and we are actually working towards that. We, too, are going to be re-designing our Website with an eye towards improved search and making more of the database available online.

We have database records in electronic form back to 1964 and we're actually also contemplating what we do with the information pre-1964 and how to get that up online, but that's going to be something we tackle later. Right now we're working on how to improve our Website to enable access online.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any, any more questions from council?

Okay, then we can go to the audience. Again, I remind you that when you come to the microphone, give us your name and your institution
and if questions do come back up from council, I will defer back to council -- oh, wait, okay.

MS. PARKER: Sorry, this should be quick.

Ric, you mentioned complete re-design of the whole Web presence for GPO, everything. Can you tell us a little bit more about that and a time frame that you're working in.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Marian. Is this on, hello?

Thank you Marian, very good question.

I think that one of the things that you may have noticed in the past, all of us as users of GPO Access is that we've often lacked an integrated design between GPO.gov, GPO Access and some of the other components of our site. And I think that one of the major things that we're trying to do, and this is a precursor to some of the earlier releases that you'll see with the future digital system, is to try to really establish a consistent look and feel throughout the site so that it's easy to navigate. And again, I think one of the, the very first components that we're starting on with this is
the FDLP desktop, which is near and dear to everyone in this audience.

Like all of you, I am a frequent user of the FDLP desktop but also probably like all of you, I have a very hard time finding information on the FDLP desktop, especially when I only have about two minutes to find it.

So what that's led to is probably way too many bookmarks on my personal Web page just for that one part of the site. So that, that is one of the key drivers and, you know, we're going to be doing, we've assembled a team of -- at GPO, it's one of the best cross-functional teams that I've seen since I've been at the agency, not only in terms of designers, but also people who understand what, what we call the governance model or, you know, how the site, both the agency site and GPO Access are actually structured and need to be structured in the future.

So, you know, the session that we're having today to give you a chance to evaluate the early parts of the FDLP desktop is just a start. We're going to do a lot more
collaboration before we release anything, but we're going to be going through a lot of beta testing in the next several months.

MS. PARKER: And the follow-up on that is is that session for council or for an education session?

MR. DAVIS: Yeah, this particular session is an educational session.

MS. PARKER: And when can we have one?

MR. DAVIS: What we'll also do is we'll make any of this information available online through beta testing as well so that council and others have a chance to look at it.

MS. PARKER: Fabulous, thank you.

MS. MILLER: This is Ann, I have a follow up to Marian's, follow-up to her question.

In part, as part of this beta testing, I mean I guess that's why we're going to look at it, but usability studies, because the current one as we all know would not actually pass a usability study, so, you're planning on doing, like, you know, asking a few people who are in this audience who might need
to use it on a regular basis to really thoroughly
test it?

MR. DAVIS: Yeah, some things that we've
tried in the past, we've tried a lot of different
options in terms of improving usability and doing
usability testing and we're certainly open to ideas
for the future, but, you know, in addition to
putting the information up on the site, we've, we've
done things unfortunately kind of limited to here in
DC beyond doing them at conferences of having
people actually come over to a usability testing
lab, using the two-way mirror concept with, you
know, recorded key strokes and recorded screen
monitoring to actually see how people interact with
the site.

Likewise, we work closely with the
Department of Education on Section 508,
accessibility for those with disabilities and other
things.

So we're going to be doing a number of
different things, but there are probably things that
we're not even aware of about how we could test and
as part of our survey process, we're very open to
ideas to make sure that all voices are heard in the process.

MS. MILLER: Well I just would like to point out that there are a lot of depositories in the DC areas and you could probably just go to one of their regular depository librarians and do it, rather than talking to people who might be so in to the biz that they don't actually, I mean in terms of Web design. I mean the thing is is that when someone like me who's been doing this for 13 years can't find something on that site, that's a problem, so, it. So you just need the real depository people to look at it.

MR. DAVIS: And I think that's a very good point and, you know, something that we've done in the past and I know Ann, you participated in these along with others, we call them evening focus group sessions and we had selected members like yourself and others from the community come in and do that testing and I know that's something we'll continue to do as well.

MS. PARKER: Ric, the time frame on this?
MR. DAVIS: We've had thus far all of three meetings, but like a lot of things, we're going to, we're going to progress rapidly on this. Beyond the three meetings, again, we've done extensive work the last couple of months on the FDLP desktop design, that is the first phase.

The second phase is to factor this out to GPO.gov and GPO Access as a whole. I, it's hard right now to really give an exact time frame and in my own mind I see this as a, you know, a four- to six-month effort in terms of getting this out, but we have to factor in not only the re-design, but we're also looking at improved functionality, so that will be a key part of the process in terms of defining the time frame.

I mentioned during my speech that, you know, any project we do at this point we don't take on haphazardly, we come up with a very detailed project management approach with milestones, we make sure we've actually got the resources to do them.

For those things we don't have resources for, we contract out and we're going to apply that principle to this as well.
MS. PARKER: Great, thanks.

MS. FRANGAKIS: I have a question for, a couple of questions for Ric.

If we, if, Ric are we going to have an opportunity to get any more information about the pilot project for the digitization during this meeting?

MR. DAVIS: I don't think we're going to have a particular educational session on that. We will be able to discuss it in more detail in the two operational open forums. I think those are the two sessions where we can go into some more detailed discussion about what we're looking for as part of that evaluation process.

MS. FRANGAKIS: Okay, for just some, for quick purposes here, can you give us a time frame for this project, for the pilot project or the demonstration project?

MR. DAVIS: This demonstration project was something that was approved by our oversight committee, the Joint Committee on Printing. It is a six-month evaluation project. It's scheduled to end in December and at that point we're going to be
presenting a summary report of our activities and
the evaluation back to our oversight committee and
our plan is to further share that information with
the depository community and then we'll have
discussions with them on next steps beyond the
demonstration phase.

MS. FRANGAKIS: Is there a plan in
progress for ramp-up once you look at your lessons
learned from this?

MR. DAVIS: We've been following closely
our, you know, our priorities for digitization that
we've set forth with the community and we would be
building upon that plan for ramp-up beyond the
demonstration project phase.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other questions from
council?

MR. BYRNE: I have a question for NTIS.
For the, for the material that you would be sharing
with depositories, is this going, you talked about
it being -- it would be linked to the digital, is
this going to be material that resides on NTIS
servers or is it at agencies and is this -- or is
this material that is not being provided by the
agencies in digital format now and that NTIS is
digitizing.

MS. HERBST: Well, the first caveat is I
get myself in trouble when I talk technically, so
I'm going to skirt the specific answers.

Frankly on where the information is
going to reside, part of the pilot is going to be
what makes the most sense for the users. The
collection -- the NTIS collection resides both on
NTIS servers, but obviously it's all information
that has come from other source agencies.

Now I can't speak to whether all that
information still resides there, but all of the
collection at NTIS is backed up on NTIS servers.
How we will present that during this pilot is part
of the discussions that we're having and frankly one
of the areas I'd like some input on from folks.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other questions?

Okay, then we will go to the audience.

MS. WEST: My name is Amy West,
University of Minnesota. This is also a question
about NTIS.

One thing I was wondering about is
whether either in the pilot project or presumably beyond you're going to be looking at materials that would be in scope for NTIS but are not necessarily showing up in the NTIS database?

And an example would be FAA technical reports which are being made available in full text and if they are in the NTIS database, there seems to be a substantial lag between the time they show up on the FAA site and NTIS and it, from my perspective, would be wonderful to be able to gather those things back and get them recorded so that we at least know that they are there --

(End Track 2 on CD.)

(Beginning Track 3 on CD.)

MS. WEST: -- were at one time, so if that can be part of the project of the future, that would be super.

MS. HERBST: The pilot will involve that which NTIS already has in its collection, because we want to stay focused on providing access to what we have and determine what are the issues with that before moving forward.

To your point about what's in the
collection, NTIS operates, one of the mandates it operates under is the American Technology Preeminence Act which says that source agencies that have relevant type of information deposit it with NTIS, scientific and technical, with technical being defined fairly broadly.

Things have changed over the years and whereas in the past we would work directly with an individual in an office or an agency and receive information in paper, we, like others, are using the Internet to collect more and more of the reports. In fiscal year 2006, 95 percent of what we received in came in electronically, either sent by the source agency or we collected it on harvesting.

Part of our strategic initiative is to increase the amount that we get into the collection each year. 10 years ago it was averaging about 50,000 titles a year. It had dropped to as low as 30,000 a couple of years ago and with increased efforts in electronic gathering, we're back up to about 40,000 in fiscal year '06 and our plan is to continue to increase that number.

Thanks.
MR. SUDDUTH: Ann.

MS. MILLER: If you're harvesting it from the Web for NTIS, this is sort of for both Judy and you, shouldn't that be a part of GPO's mandate to harvest and catalog that material? Why is it going to NTIS?

MRS. RUSSELL: That's one of the reasons Ellen and I have been talking is she doesn't have an appropriation and we do, there are areas obviously significant subject overlap between our initiatives and so we're looking for places where both agencies can gain by collaboration.

Certainly if we're harvesting things that are within scope for them and can deliver them to them with a cataloging record, then they can add source terms and other kinds of things, but it would help them in terms of efficiency. And certainly if they're finding things that we haven't found through our technique, so that's part of what we're trying to learn is where we can help one another and collaborate as agencies for more comprehensive coverage.

MS. MILLER: But if it goes to NTIS,
it's no longer freely available to the American public.

Shouldn't it be freely available to the American public?

MRS. RUSSELL: Well, as Ellen was very careful to say in her statement, that isn't really NTIS' responsibility. That is the responsibility of the publishing agency to make it available to GPO for the FDLP.

So we're sort of going above and beyond what's actually required in the statute, recognizing that in order to do its own mission, NTIS is doing some of the same kinds of things we're doing to try to identify this content rather than waiting for things to be provided to, to them or to us.

So, we, we both have the common problem that there are statutes there that tell agencies that they should make it available to us, but that doesn't necessarily mean it happens as efficiently or comprehensibly as we would like. So we think that there's real advantage to working together.

MS. MILLER: Well, I'm trying to figure out how there's an advantage to the American
taxpayer here, because if, if it's, if it's freely
available, and it should be freely available, then
the poor sap who actually finds it on NTIS as
opposed to the GPO FDsys or whatever we're calling
it is the one who's going to end up paying for it
because he doesn't know it's in the other place and
that's our opportunity to say, gee, you shouldn't
have to pay for that, that should be on the GPO
service.

MRS. RUSSELL: Well, remember what Ellen
said, that a significant amount of their revenue is
from people who are asking them to produce a
ing a tangible copy for them and to distribute a tangible
copy.

MS. MILLER: Okay.

MRS. RUSSELL: So, when someone is
linking to a document and I don't know enough about
your finances so that may be something you need to
address, is is there currently a fee if somebody
links to an electronic document through your site?

MS. HERBST: First, I want to reiterate
what Judy said, we're working with GPO and this is
the first of what we think are going to be many
initiatives. I think we're all interested in not
duplicating effort, so I expect we'll be doing more
of these types of projects together.

I also want to reiterate that we harvest
from a source agency and if that information's up on
their Website, then obviously it's free to the
public.

Our pricing, our pricing model is
physical media based first, so if someone wants a
physical copy, there's cost associated with it.
There are subscription models where someone says I
want everything new every two weeks that's in a
certain topic and that's for a fee. We do have a
download policy that allows the first several pages
to be free.

One aspect of the NTIS collection, in
2006 the average report printed or sent out in
physical form was 138 pages, so because of the
nature of the collection being technical and
scientific, we tend to have titles that are much
longer and while we do allow people to download
longer reports for a nominal fee, we find that a lot
of people don't, that they, once they realize how
large it is from the abstract, they go ahead and
purchase a physical form of it.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.
And in part to answer your question and
maybe I can lend a little insight from private
industry that private industry, for example, we
would purchase NTIS data in bulk and process it in
bulk and cross-link information to it in bulk and we
would get that information from NTIS, whereas I
think GPO is more of an individual one- or
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two-delivery type situation and we didn't mind
paying for NTIS information because it was very good
information in one place where we could go get it.
It's just a matter of how you deliver it I think
that would be the difference.

MRS. RUSSELL: We have lots to learn in
our collaboration, so stay tuned.

MR. SUDDUTH: Bernadine?

MS. HODUSKY: Bernadine Abbott Hodusky.

I'm happy to hear that NTIS and GPO are cooperating.
That was one of my dreams when I was at the Joint
Committee on Printing, but I've been working with
the Environmental Protection Agency staff and they
tell me that they have 50,000 EPA reports that
they're going to digitize. And they've digitized
about 9,000 so far and I am concerned that that
digitized information will be both available through
GPO depository program as well as NTIS because I
think multiple sources is good as back-up. I'm, I'm
concerned that they're not really working I think
with either agency in this project and I'd like to
see that happen.

I also would like to encourage you to
combine your catalog. I think it is absolutely
wasteful of tax dollars to have two separate
catalogs and it should be merged. And I think that
would do more to promote NTIS' sale of publications
than almost anything that you could do, is to have
all of your data in GPO Access in the monthly
catalog, on the online monthly catalogs.

So I urge you to work toward doing that.

MS. McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly,
University of Wisconsin, River Falls. We've got a
little Wisconsin thing going here.

Ric, I'd like to ask you about the OPAL
software because I was one of the people who
participated in the demonstration and for those of
you who didn't because there were only about
20 people on it, I've used a lot of Web-based
tools and this was the best one I have ever
seen.

And so my question to you to quote
Evelyn's terminology is what's the ramp-up for this?

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Michele, I'm glad
to hear that reaction. That expressed the sentiment
of myself and a lot of others who looked at it. We
had about 50 participants in the survey and I think
what we want to do now is we're going back and
analyzing all of the comments.

We want to validate that this is the
tool that we're going to go with if -- it sounds
like, you know, based on everything we're hearing we
might have hit one out of the park with this first
one. At the same time we want to be slightly
cautious in looking at one or two other tools very
quickly, very quickly meaning next 60 days and
seeing, just making sure there's nothing else out
there that's better or that there are no gaps that
this one failed to exist.
But I think looking at Lance back there and some of our other staff and planning who were very instrumental in bringing that up, Nancy Fijay and others, we're looking to bring this up in the next couple of months unless there are any issues that come up and that's part of the reason we have the archive up, as well, in case there are any final comments. But I really appreciate your thoughts on that.

MS. McKNELLY: Well I certainly hope when the ill-named FDsys comes up that this type of software can be used to make training and make people out in the community aware of what it is and what it isn't is -- what it isn't because that's going to happen pretty quickly and there are a lot of people out there who still, like me, don't get it and really want some very specific information so that we can field questions about it.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you.

MS. HARPER: Beth Harper, University of Wisconsin Madison. Talking about pilot projects, what is the -- well I know kind of what the status of LocsDocs is, we were one of the participants, but
I'm wondering when there will be a report on that?
At this meeting or future -- what has GPO discovered in doing LocsDocs?

MR. DAVIS: We have some information in the update handout, but I'm also asking our resident LOC expert to speak to that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're finishing up the report and hope to have it out fairly soon and we need to have some external discussions about what to do as far as moving forward, if we're doing it in the best possible way or if there are better ways to implement in the future.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, not from Wisconsin. Southeastern Louisiana University. I have a question and a plea. My question is is there an update on the proposed changes to the item selection process?

And my plea is if there's anything GPO can do to convince the major ILS vendors to give us the power to get usage statistics for hot links from their software, please write them letters, whatever. I think most depositories now, the majority of our use is through people with, using the hot links and
our online catalogs and most of us I think can't get

statistics on that.

So it's hard to justify maintaining
depository status without good statistics showing
that the public is using the depository materials.

And I appreciate what GPO does with, you
know, the PURL accounts, which I think were not
to entirely accurate last year, but I think the real
answer is for us to get that circulation kind of
information from our OPACS. So if there's anything
you can do to convince them, please help us.

And again, back to the item selection,
that was my question.

MR. DAVIS: I'm going to ask Laurie Hall or Linda Resler, if they're here, to make a quick
comment on that. Laurie, do you want to make a
comment?

(Not speaking in microphone).

MR. DAVIS: Come to the mic, Laurie.

MS. HALL: The plea to other vendors is
something we have to be very careful about doing, so
just so you know that. Cindy also has the
information that was posted about the item, right,
so where's Cindy? Is she here? Cindy? No?

(Laughter)

She has, she has information about the essential title, so maybe I'm confused as to what you're actually asking, so there's two things in the question. I picked up the issue about the PURLS and --

MS. SMITH: What I'm talking about is the proposed changes to item selection, for instance, the electronic stuff we would have less choice, it wouldn't be by item anymore, it would be by like agency. There were several proposed changes in the way we would select items. That's what I'm asking about.

(Not speaking in microphone)

MRS. RUSSELL: We completed the survey and gathered the comments and posted the comments about the item selection. What we had said at the time was that in order to change what we do with item selection, we need different software and in fact that was one of the reasons we did the survey, because looking ahead to how we get off of our legacy systems, we needed to have some idea of what
we wanted the next generation systems to do. So, the next steps are really dependent on how we proceed in getting software to replace Access, DDIS and so forth.

Suzanne, do you need to add something to that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Suzanne).

No, sorry, that was, I did have my coffee this morning, but those are two different disparate things. I was thinking about the essential titles versus what we were, you know, trying to do with item selection doing a one-to-one correspondence and yes, the move from DDIS which is now being discussed as part of the FDsys implementation and, you know, moving from that legacy software, moving into the ILS so that now, thank you, I remember those things, but Suzanne might have some other.

MRS. RUSSELL: So we've done the input gathering and now what we have to do is look at what the options are to, to take advantage of the inputs you've given and as we progress further, we'll be able to come back to you with maybe more refined
options and things.

But at this point, just to look at the posting that was made and the summary results and that's kind of where we are.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right, and we continue on our same vain of trying to do one-to-one correspondence so we don't have, you know, one item number with multiple systems. We're trying to develop the, continue on the one-to-one as we move forward.

MR. SUDDUTH: Fran?

MR. BUCKLEY: Ric, you mentioned some disaster recovery plans, but what about the mirror site or a complete back-up system for everything that's on GPO Access?

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Fran, let me give you a few more details on that GPO has been operating under a contract with Iron Mountain Services for the last several years rolling everything back on tape back-up so that we can restore systems in the event of a disaster.

What's been more of a challenge in recent years is we want a complete redundant
fail-over and we want that, you know, before FDsys,
we're not waiting on this, we're moving forward. What we, what's been a real challenge for us is our old legacy WAIS software, wide area information server, software that you're all familiar with. What this contract is going to do that we awarded two week ago is it's going to parse and migrate all of this WAIS information to a standard open format and migrate all of that for disaster recovery, real-time fail-over and it's also going to make it easy to flow into the releases of the future digital system.

So the award of this contract was long anticipated. There was a contract prior to this that migrated some, but not all applications. WAIS has proven to be quite a challenge, but we have the contractors on board, they're sitting in the library unit working in partnership with our library staff and the chief information officer's organization, this is a four- to six-month contract and that's our plan for getting it done for a complete fail-over.

MRS. RUSSELL: We do, the data has been put up on the system, it's just been put up without
the re-formatting that will make it easier to retrieve.

So there is a fail-over system in place, but it isn't as, as functional and robust as we would like it to be. So there is lots of redundancy in the data. There is an active fail-over with the unre-formatted data, but the, as Ric said, the, the objective is to get it done so that we have it with the data that has actually been re-formatted which will add meta data to it and make it an, actually improve the ability to retrieve it and then that will also help that data go to the future system.

MR. BUCKLEY: If I could follow up, though, what you're talking about in terms of a fail-over system disaster recovery, is that going to be a live back-up, though, so that we don't see these instances where GPO Access isn't available when technical work is being done and so forth?

MRS. RUSSELL: Yes, it absolutely is something that would be a live back-over or a live fail-over once completed.

MR. SUDDUTH: Katrina?
MS. STIERHOLZ: So does that mean you're going to be off the WAIS platform entirely in four to six months?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In your dreams, Katrina.

MR. DAVIS: That's a very good question, Katrina, one I've long been waiting for myself.

What we're doing is this, this disaster recovery option that we've been talking about is by -- I don't want to get too technical for this discussion, but the information that was created for WAIS a long time ago was using GPO locator codes. By doing this migration and parsing of the information, it's going to move it to more of an XML type open format.

What that's going to do is a couple of things. It's going to allow us to immediately use a search capability that is much more opened than what we're able to use with WAIS and migrate it quickly to the releases plan with the future digital system. So we're not making a selection right now to replace WAIS prior to FDsys, this is part of FDsys and it's part of what you'll hear about in our
next discussion in terms of when that planned
release is.

But this is an absolutely necessary step
to be able to migrate it forward to FDsys. We've
got to have open standards and open information and
open formats to be able to use it with the new
search engine.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other questions from
the audience? Okay.

MS. SOLOMON: Hi. Judy Solomon from
Seattle Public Library. Just one comment about
NTIS.

There's a lot of small libraries in the
United States that are Federal depositories that
can't come to these meetings. If you could do some
really good publicity for this, it would be really
great.

Thanks.

MRS. RUSSELL: We do have a handout of
Ellen's remarks which will be given out after the
session and we will make that available as part of
the report on the meeting and certainly as soon as
we have clarified a little more of what the pilot
will be like, we will be shouting from the rooftops about it because we really do want, as Ellen said, to get all the depositories or as many as we can participating.

So we're not trying to do a pilot where we get 20 or 30 and give them access, but to design a pilot that would let everyone participate. So we will make sure that that information gets out.

MS. HALE: Kathy Hale, State library of Pennsylvania.

You have just made a lot of engineers very happy throughout the country, I believe. You do have a model, I believe, from a lot of newspapers throughout the country that they will put on table of contents or abstracts and then if you want the full document, that you can pay for that, bring your money up for it.

So I think you do have models in the business community in order to bring this to fruition, but thank you very much, I think you've made a lot of people happy.

MR. SUDDUTH: Seeing nobody else at the mic, council, any last questions?
Okay. Then we'll come back again at 10:30 a.m. You've earned an extra two minutes to your break, but we will start promptly at 10:30 a.m.

(Short recess taken).

MR. SUDDUTH: I'm going to go over a couple of announcements, also give the others who are outside the room a chance to come in, but I do want to get started and I'm going to start with announcements that have been handed to me.

A lot of these announcements have to do with lunch or dinner with your regional. The Missouri librarians will be meeting at 12:15 p.m. in the lobby.

Just another reminder, DC, Delaware and Maryland libraries will be having lunch at Capital City Brew company which at 12:15 p.m.

The Florida and Georgia depository librarians are going to meet at Capital City Brewery, 5:30 p.m. tonight, so they're not going to be going to lunch, they're going to be going to dinner this evening, that's Florida and Georgia.

And then Tuesday night the CIC documents librarians will be meeting at 6:30 p.m. at the top of the
escalator which is at the hotel entrance and that's all the announcements I have.

What I would like to remind everybody is that when you do come to the microphone, when you do come to the microphone, please state your name and your institution. And as I said, there are hand-outs for the next presentation, I'll give you another half a minute to scramble up here and get copies and otherwise we're going to start within the next minute.

Okay. It's my pleasure to introduce the next session. The next session is going to be the, is going to be a panel discussion and has to do with the program management team and the master integrator, the, again, what we all know is the future digital system and it's my pleasure to turn it over to Mike Wash who is the Chief Technical Information Officer.

MR. WASH: Good morning. What we'd like to do today is similar to what we've done over the last several conferences, is provide you with an update of our, our digital contents system, sometimes known as future digital system or FDsys,
as troubling as that is at times. But what we want to do today, particularly, is introduce the Harris Corporation.

Harris is the master integrator working with us as a partner to do the development and the build and the deployment of the future digital system and you will get an opportunity throughout, you know, the next hour to meet Harris and some of the key personnel with Harris and they'll tell you a little bit about what they're doing on this program and what a, a master integrator is.

So, today it's really four sessions here, we're going to have a brief review of what the future digital system is and things that have happened since April when we were last together. I'll cover that.

Then Harris Corporation is going to talk somewhat about their role and the work that we've done with them over the last couple of months. Then Selene Dalecky is going to come up and talk about the activities that we see going forward.

So, the next six months or so of activities of what we intend to have accomplished
and what the schedule is and the time frames. And then we'll open it up for questions from that point. So an overview, some information that we actually started sharing with this community about two years ago, just what is FDsys. The thing that we call FDsys. It's really a world-class information management system that will allow us to participate in the digital world and provide information out on a permanently accessible basis.

We've, we've stated from the beginning that we wanted the system to be a rules-based policy neutral system that could be flexible and extensible. Basically what that means is we're not setting policy with the system. We want it to be very flexible so that it can adapt to whatever the requirement is of GPO to be able to take in digital information and serve digital information out and it also needed to be able to work well within the business units within GPO. We have certainly the library program, we have the sales program, we have digital media services.

There's a number of different types of focus activities within GPO. This system needed to
really be an enabler for all of those as best we
can, so in the work that we've done, you know, since
we started creating our concept and the requirements
for this system, we've been very interactive with
other aspects of GPO working very hard to try to
make sure that we could anticipate the needs of the
system and get those incorporated into what we call
the requirements for the system.

And then modular and adaptable is also a
very key element. Again, take the technology aside
for a second and realize the rate of change of the
information world that we live in today. Search
technologies are rapidly evolving and changing, for
example. We want to make sure that a system like
the GPO information management system will be
capable of accepting new technologies as they become
available so that we can plug them in and unplug
them as required to meet your needs and others
needs, you know, that are going to be using the --

(End Track 3 on CD.)

(Beginning Track 4 on CD.).

MR. WASH: -- the future digital system.

So that founding principle of the system
is also very important because we know that there's going to be rapid changes in technologies and we don't want to get locked into the technology of 2006. We want to be able to make it so that this system can change as technology changes.

From an overview perspective, you know, just the things that the future digital system are expected to do, it's going to automate the collection and dissemination of electronic information.

The next one is the electronic markings for what we sometimes call digital signatures in today's technology phrases will indicate that the information is authentic and it will be able to identify versions of documents that have been, been revised. So we want to make sure that the system is capable of doing version control and capable of identifying that the information is authentic and that type of technology needs to be incorporated into the system.

Information will be permanently available in electronic format. It's a pretty tall order when you think about the changes in
technology. Again, that's happened even in the last
decade or two, the way content has been created or
information or documents in publications have been
created change very, very rapidly and for us to
create a system that will make information
permanently accessible, it's quite a challenge to
make sure that we do the planning in anticipation of
technologies so that we can keep up with those
changes over time.

Information will be accessible for Web
searching, viewing, downloading and printing. You
know, Bruce yesterday was trying to project when
printing would start to go away and he, he indicated
it will, he couldn't say when.

We don't want to have this type of
system create the type of environment that would
force printing to go away. Instead this system has
to work very closely with printing needs. The world
of printing today is changing in the way people use
printed material and the system needs to be capable
of supporting changes in the way people use print,
whether you use print like today where there's
documents that are available in a library or in the
future if documents are going to be downloadable and
printable and used, you know, for a brief period of
time and then recalled again and printed again when
you need it in the future, much like small office
type of environments are today where you print a
document, you use it and the next time you need it,
you find it, you print it again and you use it.
Whatever the methodology's going to be
going forward with information, we want to make sure
the system is capable of supporting that.
And then lastly, document masters, and
that would be the authentic version of the
information will be available for conventional and
on-demand printing, so whatever the system or
whatever the users or partners like the library
systems need, we want to make sure that the system
is capable of really supporting that.
Our status, actually when, when I was
with this community back in April in Seattle, the
day that I provided an update was actually the day
that our request for proposal sent out for bid, it
was April 3rd. That proposal was a rather lengthy
document that included all of our requirements and a
1. lot of contractual language that kind of makes your
2. head hurt to read it, much less write it, but it
3. went out, it was like 500 pages or something crazy
4. like that.
5. It went out in April and that really
6. launched us into really the last phases of the
7. search for what we call a master integrator. And
8. the master integrator, which you'll hear more about
9. in a few minutes, is really the group of people
10. working with GPO to design, develop and deploy the
11. system.
12. So we had to choose carefully. We had
13. to be very critical and make sure that the partner
14. that we were out looking for would be the right
15. partner for us to get this job done and get it done
16. the way we wanted it to deliver the types of
17. requirements that we had worked so hard to create.
18. In August, August 2nd, we awarded to
19. Harris Corporation and that was after the RFP went
20. out in April, there was a period of time that lasted
21. until about May 24th, I believe it was, when the bid
22. was out for, or the proposal was out for bid and
23. then from late May to August was the period of time
that we went through the proposals that came in and did our final selections.

And lastly, you know, Harris showed up for work a week later with a group of people and the good news is they haven't left yet. And, you know, it's kind of funny, you know, but when you think about it, I kind of relate working with an integrator or a development team like getting married, you know.

The early stages of it when we were going through the review of the proposal process, you're getting all excited about what could be and your anticipation is really growing and then you award and you have the first couple of meetings and it's all exciting, it's kind of like you're in the stage of holding hands.

Then, you know, about a month or so later you start to realize, okay, we've got to make this work and, you know, not that that's bad, but, you know, if any of you are married, you know, like after that first month or so you kind of say we've got to make this work.

But it's been a very great, a good
transition with Harris, I've got to say that.

They've come in to GPO and they studied us probably as much or more than we studied them. Knew things about us that we probably didn't know much about and likewise with them. But the relationship has gone great, so far, and, you know, the anticipation is it will continue to go great. They've moved into GPO, so this is a co-location type of activity so it's not they're over there in another building in another State and we're here trying to communicate via phone and Internet.

Instead, you know, they've moved in with us so that there's this cohabitation type of thing going on. They've also kind of learned a lot about a culture that's kind of been developed around this program at GPO. Bruce yesterday talked about how, you know, within the leadership at GPO there's people that have some, some lengthy Government experience and those that don't have much Government experience, like the relationship I have with Scott Stoval. He's got a lot of Government experience, I have almost none, two and a half years or so now which is probably a lot.
But still, I don't consider myself to be an expert of all the things that go on within Government. But what that has done with this program is that it has allowed us to create an environment and a culture within the future digital system program office that is different than a lot of cultures I think within Government and certainly within GPO.

We have some of the brightest people at GPO working on this program that are very task oriented, they are very delivery focused and they, they were ready and primed for when Harris came in on August 9th to start this job and it's been an incredible integration activity just for the last couple months watching the GPO program management office and the Harris development team come together.

So I'm really glad they haven't left yet.

Back in April, and even dating back to last October of this session, I introduced the idea of us going through a process of creating multiple releases for the future digital system. If we were
to try to create all the functionality at once and turn the thing on and hope that it worked, the likelihood is it wouldn't.

So what we've done instead is we've carved out elements of the program and elements or sections of the requirements and we've put those into a step-wise type of releases. Like sometimes I refer to it like building a house, you start with the foundation, you build a basement, you do the first floor, you do the second floor and finally you do a lot of the enhancements to your house. That's the way we're doing the future digital system, so that we're going to start out with elements of functionality and move into higher and higher capability over time.

So our anticipated releases, you know, back about a year ago, were three releases in what we called release one, which is the core functionality where we talked about a submission release and then a content access and delivery release and then final core functionality, but what we have done now and a lot of this came through when we were reviewing the proposals of the integrators.
that came in looking to really get awarded with this job is we really came down to two releases within our core functionality.

The first release is an internal pilot and you'll learn a lot more about that in a few minutes of what's involved in that and the timing for that. And then finally our release 1C is the external launch and the core functionality of the system. And then we anticipate ongoing enhancements.

You think back to the comment I made about modular and expandable type of system. We know that there are going to be things that come up for a new functionality that needs to come along, so those enhancements for the future releases are the things where new technologies can get put into the system to do things that we know are going to be required in a couple of years and beyond.

So with that, I would like to introduce the first of the Harris staff, Karen Hoppel, who's the program manager within Harris and what she's going to do is outline some of the things associated with what a master integrator does and actually from
this point forward, we can stop really calling it a
master integrator, we can call it Harris
Corporation, GPO's partner. It might sound a little
less technical, but with that, I'll turn it over to
Karen.

Thank you.

MS. HOPPEL: Thanks, Mike. And not only
would it sound a little less technical, it will also
sound a little less formal and the relationship that
we've been developing with the GPO has been a very
open one and one in which we feel very able and
comfortable with making our suggestions known and
listening to the suggestions of our partners at GPO,
so I think it would be also more reflective of that.

I just wanted to touch on some of our
background and maybe why we are, have been so
honored as to be selected as the partner with the
GPO for developing the future digital system. We're
a company that's about 105 years old.

We actually started in the printing
business, believe it or not. We progressed or at
least modified a little bit of what we do now and
it's more involving communications as a whole and
that includes information processing like a digital archives kind of system as we're doing here. And, in fact, we do that both for the commercial and for the Government space. We have about 13,000 employees worldwide, so we're not a small company. We are headquartered in Melbourne, Florida, but have over seven offices in the local DC area, so we're very glad to be here having, you know, gotten here in August and then plan to stay not only, you know, for the next year or two, but as long as we're of use to the GPO.

We've been building archives, large, high volume kind of archive systems for over 10, 20 years and the content of those archives includes both documents, meta data, geospatial data, census data like the MAIF TIGER format, if folks are familiar with that, and audio and video. We were the runner-up on the national archives and records administration's electronic records archives program and we've been investing in laboratories and research in the archives area, including search for many years.

We're involved in the library community
in a number of ways and we are very honored to be able to extend that participation now with this program. We've been involved with the Fedora project, we are a part of their preservation workflow and search committees. We're also involved in the, being some, doing some consultant work with the National Sciences Digital Library, as well as with the, with the integrated digital library system.

So we, we really enjoy the interactions that we've had with the library community and look forward to being able to continue those and we look forward to being able to apply the experiences that we had to this very exciting program with the GPO.

And as Mike said, I'll give you a little information of sort of what our role is relative to the future digital system in working with the GPO. We're responsible for designing, developing, deploying and testing this system in conjunction with the GPO. We're working hand in hand with them to do that. We're collaboratively collecting the technologies and products that will be used as part of the system.
As we speak today, we have teams of which there's a co-lead, one from Harris, one from GPO and those folks are off looking at the various technologies that we might need, for instance, what search application would be best for us to use and they are mutually working to develop the criteria to collect those products as well as going through that scoring and selection process.

From that point we'll integrate the selection of those commercial products into an integrated system and be able to develop the workflows that will control how the system works. That's really the way that you implement the policy neutral non-, you know, non-dictative, if you will, ability of the system to allow it to comply to the operations that are useful to the community and to, and as opposed to being prescriptive.

We'll also conduct system testing to know that everything is working well and ready to go and then conduct training exercises, including development of the materials and manuals that will assist folks in being able to use the system. It was nice to hear that there's a, that there's the
OPAL activities that you have going on and we hope
to look at those and see if we can learn that it
found a forum that really works well for
communicating and potentially providing training on
the system.

And we well see it being very key that
in order to be able to do this effectively, that we
work in conjunction with the GPO and the community,
stakeholder community at large. We have been
working, as I mentioned, just very, very closely
with the GPO. This is a closer working relationship
than I've had ever in my career; and Mike is not too
far off when he says it's sort of like, at least
getting engaged, I'm not sure about married yet, I
think we'd want to date a little while. No.

But, no, not at all. Actually, we've
found the folks that we're working with to be very,
very helpful to us. They bring a domain experience
that is just vital to us being able to make sure
that we can apply the right technologies to the
mission. Without that understanding that they
bring, you know, we would build the wrong thing.

We also are going back into the GPO's
business units to look for the subject matter
experts that will really, that will really also add
to the accuracy with which we can develop the system
to be what is needed.

And further than that, we need to engage
and starting as we have been here now two months to
engage the stakeholder community at large, obviously
through forums like this conference as well as other
mechanisms that Selene will talk about a little bit
for the opportunity for beta testing on the system
so that again, at all levels we know that the folks
who are going to have to use this system are getting
the best thing that will make their jobs most
efficient and enable them to really step forward in
the future when I imagine that everything is, or at
least all of the, all of the electronic publications
we know are safe and, and available forever, so.

With that, our next speaker is John
Fore. He's our software architect and he promises
not to get, to get too far into engineering, if you
will, but to focus on how we really see the system
working and how it will enhance what you guys need
to do with it.

MR. FORE: Thanks, Karen. My name is John Fore, I'm the software architect for the Harris team on the future digital system and I'm going to explain to you briefly how the system will work according to the design that the GPO and Harris have developed.

Even though I've been a software engineer for 23 years, my first job was actually working at a library, I was working to convert our local library from a paper-based system to an electronic system. I also grew up near Dublin, Ohio, and I think about half my family either work at a library or work at OCLC, so this, this project is really near and dear to my heart.

I've also worked on the electronic records archive project and have been working in the digital archiving field for over four years now.

So, what you see in this picture is an overview of the elements of the future digital system and the future digital system will be based on the Open Archival Information System model, or OAIS model. The GPO and Harris are using this model
to guide the development of the system. It's a standard that dictates best practices for a digital archives system, so by following it, it helps you to ensure that your archive will work properly and will protect the information that you're storing. And each box on this diagram represents an element within the system and within the OAIS model.

The blue arrows in between the boxes represent information flowing from one part of the system to another and the icons representing people indicate parts of the system where people are involved in working on the system. The other boxes are fully automated.

So, if you start on the left most box labeled producer, we have the people who are creating the publications, which is the Government agencies and the U.S. Congress and they will create publications that are, are, should be disseminated to the public. And they will submit them to the future digital system using a Web-based interface, as well as other interfaces, and with each publication they will supply the content of the publication as well as meta data or information.
about that content and at the same time as they're submitting a publication, they can also order printed copies of the publication for their use.

Information can also be collected for the future digital system by scanning or converting physical documents and it can be harvested from agency Websites. So those are the three ways that information can be collected and submitted to the system.

It will go into the next box labeled ingest and in this, in this box the future digital system will automatically validate the content in the meta data package that comes in to make sure that the meta data is complete and correct and that the document hasn't been corrupted in transmission. If there are any problems with the package, then a GPO user will work with the agency to correct that so that only valid information that's authentic gets into the future digital system.

Next it will go into the data management element of the system. In this element the authentication marks will be added to the document. It will be indexed by a search engine and any
preservation actions that need to be done to it over
time will be orchestrated by the data management
element.

The content and meta data will be stored
in the archival storage portion of the system where
it will be protected and stored to provide the
permanent access.

In the access portion of the system, GPO
users will catalog each publication using marked
records and standard cataloging techniques, also
create reference tools and finding aides to help
people find documents within the system.

Then finally, on the far right the
consumer represents end users of the system which
could be the public, it could be the FDLPs, it could
be Government people, they will be able to search
for documents in the future digital system by using
meta data searching as well as by content searching
and they'll be able to retrieve and view authentic
copies of the publications that are stored in the
future digital system.

So, moving on, I'm going to show you a
technique that we're using to store and manage and
preserve these publications across time that's called an information package, or a content package.

There will be one content package for every publication in the future digital system and the purpose of the content package is to collect all the information we need about that publication so that we'll know what it is, who created it, how it's stored, allow us to find it in the future and to preserve it.

And to help keep track of all this, we will have an XML wrapper as part of this package that's like a table of contents that tells everything in the package, what everything is that's in this package that we need to store and it will be in XML so that it's in a non-proprietary and open format so that you can look at that and understand what that publication is and where it came from and what we know about it.

So the actual content, itself, will be stored in the content section of the package and we can store what we call a rendition, which is an expression of the publication in a certain format.

For example, a rendition might be the
original core or end design or Microsoft Word files that the originator created the publication in and this rendition can be a complex set of digital objects. As I'm sure you know, most core publications consist of images and text and other pieces, so the future digital system will be able to store compound documents and keep track of what is in each piece of that rendition so that the original publication can be, can be maintained.

Now within the content package is a meta data section and each rendition will store important meta data that allows us to use and preserve that publication, the first being representation information. This tells you how the information in that publication is stored and how to access it, so, for example, it could say this is a core 6.0 publication and we would know what software you need in order to access that or it may be more detailed, depending on the format of the information.

We also will store descriptive information about the publication. This is your typical bibliographic information that tells what the publication is and describes it. This
information is really important for searching so that we can find this publication in the future and know what it is. We'll also store preservation information.

The preservation information records the providence, so where did this document come from, the context that it was created in, which is important to understand the purpose of the document, why was it created and what does it mean, any reference identifiers, like ISBN number, and also fixity information that is a computer technique that allows us to make sure that the document hasn't been corrupted while it's been stored in the system.

Then we'll have technical meta data about the document. This records the, for example, a jpeg would record the resolution in dots per inch, the size of the publication, the color usage. This, this, with this information we can tell exactly the quality of the publication and how it's stored.

Finally, we'll record administrative information about the publication to track the history of this publication within the future digital system.
So I know, I know this is kind of a lot, but this is what we feel and the community at large feels is necessary to keep these publications forever and keep them usable. We can also add additional renditions of the publication to the package so that, for example, the first rendition might be the original core files that the publication was created in.

The second rendition could be a press optimized prescript file for printing the publication and then you can have additional ones, maybe a screen optimized PDF which is convenient for users on the Internet to, to download and view. And using, by, by tracking and storing this information about a publication is a key to our ability to preserve it and make it useful across time.

So now I'd like to introduce Selene Dalecky from the PMO.

MS. DALECKY: Thank you very much.

(End Track 4 on CD.)

(Beginning Track 5 on CD.).

MS. DALECKY: Thank you very much, John.
As he said, I'm Selene Dalecky, I'm with the program management office and I'll be batting clean-up for this presentation.

So once again, we've gone back to the releases by functionality and how GPO and, with Harris, will be implementing the system capabilities over a series of releases starting with Release 1B in early 2007.

Okay. We start to show the functionality in 1B that will be -- this is a slide where we start to show 1B and this is the functionality that we will release in an internal pilot. It represents a core functionality of the future digital system which means being able to get content and meta data into the system, being able to manage the content and meta data within the system and being able to have users find and retrieve this content and meta data. And since FDsys is an OAIS-based system, Release 1B will demonstrate the capability to submit, manage and retrieve this content and meta data in information packages.

So, in Release 1B in the internal pilot, these are things we know we have to get right. This
is setting the foundation for the system and the series of releases that will take place going forward.

Release 1B is a pilot which means it will not be open to the public, but we are planning to involve various user communities in beta testing it. For an example, we'll be turning to our Federal agency customers to test the commission processes for these content packages and we will be looking for end users to beta test the access portions of the system.

Okay. Release 1C will be our first public release. It's scheduled to be launched in the second half of 2007. We're going to be expanding on the core functionality that was developed and implemented in 1B by adding basic authenticity and integrity checks on the content and by extending the access beyond the initial beta testing group.

Release 1C will also include the ability to exchange data with the GPO ILS, which means that bibliographic information coming into FDsys will be sent to the ILS and conversely, any changes that are
made to information in the ILS will be sent to FDsys.

Release 1C will also introduce the first preservation processes, which is, will be the process of refreshment.

In implementing the future digital system, we have been following a process called phases and gates. We've used it from the beginning and we're going to use it throughout all of the different release implementations. Each phase contains clearly defined activities and deliverables. At the end of each phase there's a gate review and this gate review is, the purpose is to make a management decision on whether or not the program should proceed to the next phase.

We've already completed -- or completed phases 1 through 3, actually 1 through 4A and for Release 1B, we've moved into phase 4B.

One thing to note here is that gates 4A through gate 6 are going to be repeated for each release, so it's not going to be a total of six gates. There's going to be multiple gates throughout the releases and this is, this will allow
us more reviews so that we can keep checking at the
end of each phase before we proceed to make sure
we're doing the right things and rolling this out in
the best way.

   Just like when Mike said that we're
doing multiple releases to make sure that we are
mitigating risk as much as possible, reducing the
risk as much as possible. The phases and gates
approach does the same thing.

   Okay. So here's a little more detailed
view of our Release 1B and 1C timeline. For

Release 1B, we are in phase 4B, so we're developing
the architecture and moving towards a detailed
design, the detailed system design. You can also
see from this chart that 1B and 1C do have overlap,
so it's not going to be consecutive phases where we
do all of 1B and then we, you know, put in the
marker in the ground and then move on to 1C.

   We are actually going to be doing some
of the activities concurrently and this will allow
us to compress the implementation timeline.

   Okay. We have a number of upcoming and
ongoing activities in conjunction with the design
and development of the future digital system. We have a series of trade study reviews that we'll be doing for each of our releases. These will -- the process that we're going to be using to select the key technologies.

Right now we're concentrating on the core functionality of 1B, which consists of a content management system review, search application review and enterprise application platform review. And we do have more information on the trade process on the GPO FDsys Website if you're interested in looking at that.

We're also beginning to develop the future digital system work flows and use cases which will help to define the sequence of steps within the system and also will help us define how users will interact with the system. Right now we're focusing on the 1B work flows and use cases, but the work flows and use cases for 1C are not going to be far behind.

We're continuing our outreach activities through programs such as this and through meeting with our various stakeholders just like we've been
attempting to do all along. We are also kind of focusing right now on the submission side. We're working very closely with our Federal agency content originators to make sure that in 1B we have the ability to have user -- or have content originators submit information and then have the system be able to ingest this information.

Let's see. We, okay, and then the beta testing, I know we've kind of dangled a beta testing carrot a couple of times in the presentation, but we are planning for 1B, even though it's an internal pilot, we are planning to do beta testing with our user communities. We are in the early stages right now of beta test planning, but we will be working with library services and content management on a plan to work with the library community, so there will be more information forthcoming on this and we expect beta testing to take place in April of 2007.

We have just very recently released a new requirements document, Version 3.0, it also is available on the FDsys GPO Website. We've added about 1,200 requirements if you want to take a look at those. It's mostly driving the existing
requirements to make them clearer and testable, but it's there and it's great reading, so I highly encourage you to take a look at it.

Design activities are well underway for Release 1B and we are very excited to be working with Harris as you've heard before and it's been a very exciting experience for us and we're looking forward to the next few years. And of course more information is coming on beta testing and we expect it to happen in April 2007 and we will be looking to the library community for assistance with that.

And finally, I've referred to the Website a couple of times, so here's the URL if you're interested in going to get more information. We do keep it updated with any new current -- or any new or upcoming activities. We have a section on stakeholder communication and we have it broken out by the individual groups that we work with and we have a questions and comments submission, ability, too, so that if you're interested in finding out more information and you don't find it on the site, we're more than happy to respond to any questions or accept any feedback that you have.
So, thank you.

(Applause)

MR. SUDDUTH: Questions from council?

MR. WARNICK: A simple question first, the contract has been let, what was the value of the contract? How much money?

MR. WASH: The, can you hear me now?

The estimate that we have for FDsys through Release 3 is just about 29 million dollars. The way the contract has been awarded is we're really awarding for Release 1 with options for Release 2 and 3 and Release 1 is valued at about 16 million dollars.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill. I have a number of questions, actually.

Based upon my previous experience designing and building large-scaled systems such as this, one thing is, as far as metrics and management capabilities we heard Bruce talking about giving the managers the power and enabling them to be able to make decisions and to what degree has there been reporting and data mining capabilities designed into this system for things such as acquisition, knowing
how many documents you have processed, where, when and how much?

MR. WASH: I guess I'll look to either Gil or -- Gil.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, I guess, I guess that's a call out to me. The, one of the areas of FDsys development that I oversee is the data mining capability and we do have a whole section in the requirements on data mining. It's primarily a Release 2 and beyond activity, so I think the capabilities that Peter is referring to we have well covered in the requirements and we look forward to putting them into play.

MR. HEMPHILL: That's great, because I spend a lot of my time building a system just to manage all of the different information as you can imagine, having all of this information and just knowing how much of what you have was a challenge.

The second question I had was accepting fees from FDLP partners, I noticed on the slides where it was primarily Congress and agencies and as we discussed yesterday with Bruce building retrospective collections, you're going to need help
in providing that information. And I know a lot of
different institutions have already some of this
stuff scanned. I don't know if it's to the
standards of the, of the FDsys, but to what, to what
degree do you have the capability to feed

MR. WASH: Kirk, can you take that one, Kirk Knoll.

MR. Knoll: Good question, Peter. We
hope to have partnerships and to work with other
agencies or other libraries that have scanned and I
have a dream of a standard where maybe all the
scanning, you know, was standardized and all the
submission was standardized. But until that
happens, we have to work together and have
conversations to make sure that, that we do have
something similar that we could use and provide to
FDsys to provide access to that.

We will be working, you mentioned that
you saw a slide where we're working with the
agencies and Congress, but certainly the library
system has been a huge partner to this, up to this
point, I think you know that. If it was missed on
the slide, we've worked closely with the library
community and our team at GPO is, is heavily -- has
a lot of, I'm sorry, a lot of members from the GPO,
Superintendent of Documents and Library Services, so
we have our hooks into the library community.

MR. HEMPHILL: Okay, and lastly, is
there going to be a feedback mechanism for
addressing quality issues that may come up that the
community out there may not be able to take care of
situations that may, may come up overall, because
many times if it didn't get caught by our QC
process, the end users were the ones that, that
c caught that situation.

Is there a means or a method that's
being designed in this system to provide active
feedback to take care of those issues?

MR. WASH: Clarification, is it feedback
once we receive content from, like, a library
partner? Is that what you're referring to?

MR. HEMPHILL: Any partner, whether it
be agency, Congress, if you see something like an
image that comes up that's black.
MR. WASH: Oh, okay. One of the elements that was in that chart that John Fore went through was validation type of process when information comes in and that's a really critical aspect in the requirements in some of the design. We call that early stages of ingest of the information coming into the system.

And at that point in time is where information will be reviewed and if there's problems associated with it, it will be handled, or at least put into a location where some sort of activities can take place to make sure that it's corrected.

So I don't know if it completely addresses your question, Pete, but we have that in a validation stage.

MR. HEMPHILL: Well part of the issue was that there was no, in our case, there wasn't a single place where a customer or a patron could go to inform us that there was an issue with a particular document or a particular publication and as a result, the people working on the systems had fragmented information from various places and the patrons didn't, or customers did not feel like they
were being responded to adequately because we had this fragmented information that we were working with.

MR. WASH: You guys have anything to add to that? I think it's a really valid point and I'm trying to figure out if somewhere in our 3,000 requirements we have that covered.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, one way we could go into that is through the beta testing and start identifying things through the beta testing, but a second thing we could do is through the GPO help desk is to start identifying some of these inaccuracies or problems we might have.

Don't know if that answers your question fully, but.

MR. HEMPHILL: You might want to consider an online capability for active feedback from the community.

MR. WASH: Right, so I mean if somebody in the community finds a problem with content, there would be some way of communicating back with GPO that there's a problem that needs to be resolved.

MR. SWINDELLS: I have a follow-up
question of Pete's, or very similar.

Could we bring up the OAIS slide, the one with the stages, because it makes it easier to talk about. There we go.

The two places where we have GPO users where I think potentially we could have FDLP users and that is in the ingest which Pete talked about, but that could also be a place that would link up to a fugitives documents submission, so you might not actually be ingesting, but just pointing toward or something like that. But the other place is in access whereas we roll this out, specific meta data designed for different types of user communities could actually be added by those communities.

And so I think that, and I, I can't remember if that -- I think that was envisioned, but it's been so long, so I just wanted to sort of ask where that is sort of in the roll-out.

MR. BALDWIN: Hi, I'm Gil Baldwin from the Program Management Office.

I think that what, what you're asking about is encompassed in the requirements for the cataloging and meta data operations that we have
capabilities called out for users to be able to contribute meta data and that it be in processed.

I do want to make one comment about the chart that's up here now, though, and of course this is an extremely simplified view of the OAIS model and John has only chosen to exemplify in each of these little boxes one type of users, where if you go to our documentation you'll find this broken out in a much more detailed kind of way so that there are, you know, it shows that there are other people that are participating in these different functions and so forth, so.

Go ahead and take a look at that if you're really curious about how different user classes play into the system operation.

MR. WASH: Thank you, Gil. Walt.

MR. WARNICK: It's very encouraging that Harris has had experience building large high volume digital archives and information systems. My question is are, is there any such system like that that Harris has built that's open to the public and if so, what is the name and what is the URL?
MS. HOPPEL: Thank you. Actually, the systems that we've built have been for other Government agencies and so they are not available to the general public, unfortunately, so they are like, for example, there -- MAIF Tiger database for the Census Bureau, you know, that's not really in general available to the public. So, sorry about that.

MR. WARNICK: No, thank you, thank you.

MR. SUDDUTH: Other questions from council? Katrina.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Yeah, this made sense to me for standard publications, but you also talk about recognizing revisions in things and one of the things that I think of is databases. How are you going to or are you going to handle databases that are not static and are you going to bring those in and recognize revisions in those databases and all the, you know, complications that come with that?

MR. WASH: Gil or Selene, could you address that one?

MR. BALDWIN: Of course you've asked one
of the hardest questions for any content management system and my colleagues have thoughtfully elected me to come up here and try, try to do something with it.

But one, our focus of course in this system because of our statutory mandate is on publications and to the degree that we can extract entities that are recognizable as publications from dynamic databases, then we will incorporate them and deal with them in the future digital system.

I think where it's not possible to harvest the dynamic database and manage it within our system we will continue the practice of having meta data pointers out to that database and you'll have to use their inherent functionality to extract the content.

MS. PARKER: This is Marian, did I hear this right that you wouldn't consider a database that is promulgated by a Government entity as a publication of that entity?

MR. BALDWIN: I'm beginning to feel like President Clinton here splitting hairs over definitions, but the, you have to go back to what
the statutory language is that talks about a
publication being something that is individually
published as a, as a single entity.

So of course, Marian, the databases that
agencies put out are official promulgations of
their, of their content and information, but they're
a bit out of scope for what we are trying to deal
with because of our statutory mandate.

MS. PARKER: Thanks.

MR. SUDDUTH: I'm going to ask a
question that I asked to a candidate that was in our
library a couple weeks ago and the answer I got back
was we're always trying to unbundle everything. And
I know that the information that we take in is, is
created by an agency, but is the system going to
look towards the future where an agency might say
here is the package of information, but we're okay
if you can divide it up so that it can be re-used in
different ways and is that looked forward to
possibly in the system?

I mean I know you can't do it, but if an
agency gets to the point, let's say the stat
abstract says hey, here's 1,400 tables, but we don't
care if you let it go individually.

MR. BALDWIN: Yes, we could do that, we have the capability.

MR. WASH: And if you look at the next slide, if you just go to the next slide where there's a -- whoops, well the next slide talks about the packaging concepts and digital objects and that was specifically laid out that way so that those digital objects could be identifiable so they'll have a unique identifier and a way of finding it so that if there was a desire to re-use or re-purpose information down to that digital object level, the system would have the capability of providing that out if agencies would allow that to occur.

MR. SUDDUTH: Other questions from council?

Questions from the audience?

MS. WEIBLE: Hi, I'm Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library and I'm glad this slide is up because I wanted to ask a little bit more about the meta data part of this. I'm really excited by the depth of information that is envisioned for the meta data for
these documents, but I'm curious about how that information is truly going to get into the system. It sounds like there's going to be at least, certainly in the initial releases a real reliance on the content provider giving that level of meta data, things like providence and that kind of thing.

You know in my library, we work with an archiving system that is for State Government information and it is extremely difficult for us to train those content providers to understand the concepts of meta data.

And so I'm just curious if you could talk a little bit more about how each one of those boxes you envision being generated? Is it going to be the content provider or is it going to be automatically extracted?

MR. BARNUM: I'm George Barnum from the Office of Innovation and New Technology. Yeah,

Arlene, it's what we see is, is this meta data building up in layers, so we don't really look for it to all come from one spot. We certainly don't any longer see ourselves absolutely in the middle of that the way we have been with cataloging. You
know, where you all looked to us for the cataloging and obviously you do lots of things to it once we're done, but we're kind of in the middle of that. That's not the model at all.

If you, this, this line-up is kind of an abstract, you can, any of you who think about meta data can, can call these out in different ways depending on what you had for breakfast and, you know, what you did last night. But these are a set of abstractions that seem to communicate most of the kinds of stuff that we're looking for. They do overlap.

I think the thing to keep in mind is that we, in the design, we recognized right away that every function from end to end will either create or use meta data, that it's absolutely everywhere and so we needed to be able to ascertain to pick up and use again or to add to.

So, you're right, the burden on the producer is great if, if we really expect that, for example, all of the providence and all that sort of thing is going to come from them. It will be part of the challenge, I think, as the thing is absolute
built to find ways to make that as simple as we can in the interface.

They now, producers, agency customers now provide us a boatload of information when they order a publication. If you've ever seen the standard form 1, it's really long, there's lots of information, so that's kind of an example of we're already doing it, we have to find a better way to do it so that they actually fill the form out right.

And then both the, the people, the GPO users and the system, itself, will continue to layer it up as we go along. And I'm talking a bit more about the meta data model and how the schema and the formats will work tomorrow.

So if you're interested in that, how we, how we envision making all of the, of the meta data formats and schema work together, come and, come and hear that tomorrow.

MS. WEIBLE: Can I just follow up a little bit, so the way I'm understanding it is the first two releases are not really dealing with the harvested content, it's really going to be submission content that, so, I mean, and that's
where my concerns about the meta data, you know, because when you're harvesting documents, you don't have the form to fill out.

MR. BARNUM: Right, right. And so you have to sort of scrape up what's left, yeah, when you bring it in and it's really hard.

MS. WEIBLE: Hard.

MR. BARNUM: Yeah, we, we recognize that and actually Matt will talk a little bit about that in his presentation on the harvesting pilot because they've looked at that really closely on the harvesting pilot.

MS. WEIBLE: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver. I have a question concerning the WAIS, GPO

WAIS database on the one hand and the CGP on the other hand. You have content in WAIS databases and then you have. --

(End Track 5 on CD.)

(Beginning Track 6 on CD.)

MR. BROWN: -- and then you have meta data in the CGP and there seems to be a disconnect for a number of years between, for example, GAO
reports and Y1s like House and Senate reports and
documents where you have the full text over here and
the meta data over there and could the FDsys make
these things talk to each other or is that in the,
is that a possibility?

Maybe George is the person for this.

MR. BARNUM: Not only can, but will.

MR. BROWN: Okay. That's a good thing.

MR. BARNUM: That's the plan, is to make
it all talk to one another.

MR. BROWN: Because there are about
several thousand where there's no links made.

MR. BARNUM: And I think in the initial
phases that's been one of our, one of our real
concerns is picking up all of the GPO Access
material and sort of getting it as the sort of first
case, so.

MR. BROWN: Good. Barbie.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of
Virginia, and mine is kind of a talk to each other
question, also. I guess because it's OAI and all of
that and everything talks to one another, but the
NTIS that we heard about earlier this morning and
those kinds of things, you know, I guess some of the arrows in this previous slide diagram, nothing goes out to, you know, sort of other agencies to talk outside of the system to other agencies content management systems, the national archives, the NTIS, whatever there happens to be out there.

MR. BARNUM: Well, again, I think it's, you're a victim of how simplified that that diagram is. In fact, yeah, that's part of, that's part of being standards based. We can, we can output packages that can be ingested into other OAIS-based systems.

We can also publish, we will publish our standard, you know, our implementation of OAIS so that other people can put together a submission package that we can recognize so that, for example, when we're receiving converted content that has been scanned in a partner library, for example, you know, the file layout will be known and we will be able to ingest it.

So, yeah, that's part of the deal. And let me also point out, Barbie, that we're also, we are looking at OAI, in addition to OAIS, we've got
OAI in the mix for that ability to share.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. I can't recall which speaker it was yesterday that lamented that libraries had not implemented tools for end user input like Amazon.com has done.

Has there been any thought to allowing end users to review documents or assign a four star rating for the most useful things or that sort of thing that you would be able to get, you know, the list of the top 100 most popular documents in FDsys or anything along those lines, because I think that would be nice?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Yes, that capability is built into the requirements and I think it's a very important value add that we're going to need as part of this system.

MR. BALDWIN: And I would just add that those were captured in the section of the requirements that's called reference tools, it's primarily out release, capabilities, Release 3, so.

MS. DALECKY: Selene Dalecky and I just wanted to add that I think it was in the Seattle
meeting we did a day in the life session for
depository libraries and this is one of the
scenarios that we had come up with, and so it's
something that we would like to do.

We've captured our requirements but we
would want to work with the community to figure out
how to implement that.

MS. WEST: Amy West, University of
Minnesota. I just wanted to make a comment because
I'm a little concerned that databases are being
defined out of the concept of publication. I
realize that in some cases that's true, but most of
the evidence that I've seen, for example, the Mellon
report from 2003 that looked at the overall
Government publications domain showed that the vast
majority of material is in a database forum one way
or another. And while there isn't always a
one-to-one correlation between them, there sometimes
is.

For example, I recently discovered that
the overseas loans and grants which we have in print
is now available online as a database. But it's an
it. It has one point of access, it's from the same
agency, it's under the same title. I don't think you can define that out as a discrete publication. It has a boundary, its content's available in one way and it concerns me a lot that that's not going to be included within the scope.

And I don't mean to be contrary, I'm just saying this represents a tremendous amount of Government information and I think it does need to be included in the future.

Thanks.

MS. LINDEN: Julie Linden from Young University.

This question is for Mike Wash, it's a follow-up to your answer to Bill Sudduth's question about unbundling.

I'm not sure I heard your answer correctly, did you say that FDsys will be able to unbundle those content packages down to the digital object if the agency allows it?

MR. WASH: The concept within the packaging is that when there is a digital object that can be called out, down to a level of granularity in the requirements, we will be able to
structure and identify that data as an object.

That was what I was trying to say, is that the capability will be there to have it structured down to that granular level and then if there's a need for and the agency is accepting of having that accessible, the system will be able to, to make that available.

So, from an information system perspective, we wanted to have the capability of going down to what we call a digital object level.

MS. LINDEN: I guess I was hung up on the if the agency will allow it part and I guess I'm not understanding whether that's just sort of in the structure of the digital object, you know, if the agency has already structured the digital object in such a way that it can be accessed at that granular level or if it's more of a policy decision, we don't want end users to be able to parcel this out at this granular level?

MR. WASH: I think it's a policy decision and what we're trying to do from a, the system design perspective, we are trying to stay policy neutral so that we're trying to get down to
the granular pieces of information and then if there
needs to be a, an agreement with an agency to make
that available, that's their policy and how we would
deal with it.

MS. LINDEN: So that's something that
will be set up in the submission package, is the
agency will be able to define that level of
granularity?

MR. WASH: I think so. I don't know if
we've necessarily thought that all the way through
yet of how the permissions would be granted. It's
more we wanted to make sure that we had structure
within the data to support it.

MS. LINDEN: I see. Okay, thank you.

MRS. RUSSELL: I think, Julie, that's,
that's kind of another piece of this, that's where
the library service content management group will be
working on the policies and the business
relationships, so I know that sometimes causes some
confusion in the community, the way that we're
structuring the capability versus the decisions of
how to use it, but I suspect that the default will
be to be able to do whatever we want and it will be
in a case where there's a reason for the agency to
preclude it that they will communicate that, rather
than the other way around.

But that comes in a different part of
the implementation in terms of looking at what's
being submitted by what agencies and what are the
relationships there that are external to the
mechanism of how we do it.

Does that help?

MS. LINDEN: Thanks, Judy, yeah, that answers my question. Yes, thanks.

MR. SUDDUTH: Fran.

MR. BUCKLEY: Fran Buckley. Could you comment on the relationship of this project with the national archives electronic records program?

I mean their project was so involved in setting up, you know, content packages and, you know, meta data that they wanted agencies to submit for their records.

MR. WASH: Gil is happy to take that question.

MR. BALDWIN: Thank you. Thank you, Mike. I really thought you were going to answer
that one in the context of a collaboration talk
about how we're working with the national archives
and other agencies so that our, the systems will be
able to exchange data and so forth.

But apparently you're expecting me to do
something different than that or you would have
answered it, so give me a clue here.

MR. WASH: No, that sounds pretty good.

I think structurally we're, we're both using similar
types of models. The OAIS. That's a very common
way of doing large information systems, you know,
with archival interest. We also are, as a result,
very much package-oriented like this drawing that's
still up on the screen where just inherent in OAIS
is the need to structure information in packages.

Beyond that, you know, where, where GPO
is going today is we're creating our package
 specifications and we're reaching out to the
 National Archives to work with us. I think back in
the Spring I mentioned that we are hosting round
tables where the archives are invited, the Library
of Congress is invited and NIST is invited and they
sit with us and we talk about interoperability of
information which will lead us to a discussion
around packages of how information should be pulled
together so that they are interoperability -- with
the goal of interoperability.

So, we are in that process right now
realizing that these agencies and others, for that
matter, are developing OAIS-based systems and
interoperability is a goal.

MR. BUCKLEY: Well a few years ago they
were balking about trying to require, in fact,
agencies to develop meta data to go along with the
records that were being submitted and I was thinking
well if they, if they moved along that path and that
as agencies were more attuned to submitting meta
data, that would benefit your program, too, if they
then submitted meta data with their records for
this.

MR. BALDWIN: Yeah. One other thing I
think would help this discussion is that there's a
very key difference in scope between what the
national archives preserves and what future digital
system will preserve and manage, that we are
publication focused, whereas the national archives
is Federal record focused. And although at an abstract level both the publication and a generic Federal record which might include E-mail or correspondence and such can be packaged, as an information package where you have the content and meta data together, really the scope of what we're doing is pretty different, so we're taking a technically similar approach to things and we studied NARA's ERA requirements in the early stages of formulating our own and of course you are aware, also, that the national archives recognizing GPO as an archival affiliate, so that I think again building to this common standard will assist us in being able to transfer our content to the national archives when the time comes to do that. And there are certain threshold events that trigger that happening.

So, have we, have we now gotten to your question, Mr. Buckley?

MR. SUDDUTH: Ann.

MS. MILLER: This is Ann Miller, Duke University. I, I just, and I know we're kind of hammering on this publication thing, but it has to
do with, you know, it gets to the scope of the
content of the system, so I have a simple question,
it's probably not so simple, is the national atlas a
publication?

It's an electronic map available on a
Web page published by an agency.

MRS. RUSSELL: And we catalog it and link
to it and yes, we do consider it an in scope
publication, so I think at the risk of going too far
out on a limb and sawing it off behind myself, I
think the issue here is what we ingest and manage
and what we may, I mean the common terminology now
is federate to or otherwise be associated with.

I mean I -- at one level if you think
about it, we're not going to replicate, I don't
think, I'll look to Mike to answer that, but the
entire Pub Med system within FDsys, we're, we, we
have contractual relationships with other agencies
to ensure permanent public access and we will find
ways to integrate those things, but is that a fair
distinction, Mike, and point to it, maybe even do
more than point to it in terms of being able to
federate searching and things to it, but we're not
And, in fact, we've had conversations with USGS about the national map and about the fact that at the moment, it is a system that allows current access to the map as it exists today and every time it changes, there is only access to what's there now.

And we've had conversations with NARA, USGS and actually LC geography and map, all of us expressing concern about permanent public access to that information and the ability in the print world we could look back at a map from a year ago or, you know, it might be when they chose to print one, but at least you could see periodic maps.

And in part that discussion was, you know, is that NARA's responsibility, is it ours, is it a joint responsibility. One of the points of conversation was maybe what we really need to do is to work collaboratively with the community to inform Congress that perhaps USGS' mission and funding need to create that, you know, kind of (inaudible) to archive.
But again, I mean Mike's building a system with capabilities and then we're going to have to make some of those policy decisions about what needs to be replicated and copied into the system and what we will relate to in another way, much like we do today, we don't copy information bridge into our systems because we have an ongoing relationship with DOE and we know that DOE is committed to permanent public access.

But where we are obtaining things from agencies that do not have that kind of a commitment and that kind of a relationship, we're harvesting data, so.

MS. MILLER: I'm just trying to get to, you know, there are more and more Government databases that kind of create information on the fly, like the national atlas. And it's creating, as you said, you know, today's information. And in the past, you know, the maps are a real question mark and that's something that, you know, I'm actually going to go back and talk to my map librarian and say I really think that maybe the maps round table of ALA needs to start.
We need some leadership here from, I think from the map community because I can't say, you know, when does a map stop, when does it change, what are, you know, what kind of standards do we need to push for in, you know, GISing data to make sure that we're ensuring that or pushing to ensure that you all are, you know, holding on to the correct information is the right way of putting it.

So, yeah, okay. Thanks.

MRS. RUSSELL: And that's a particularly interesting one because in many ways it isn't even a database on the USGS system. Large parts of that are portals where they're drawing information from State of North Carolina or they're drawing it from a municipality and so it, it's, some of that data is resident on their servers and some of that data is extracted, as needed, from other places.

So it's, it's a very, a good example of the very hardest things we are going to have to deal with and we know that and we have begun talking about it, but we don't have an easier, obvious solution to it.
MR. HEMPHILL: With regard to the follow-up question on Ann's point, where is the risk data going to be stored and who is going to be responsible for maintaining that link data when it changes. So links to other documents, external linkages to other sites, when you get fed that information, I don't necessarily see it on the diagram here, but an issue (inaudible) to some points in time and a Website will change their configuration and then a related link would need to be changed (inaudible) and it was a big labor intensive effort to go back and change those referenced items unless they were kept in a database in the proper reference on that Web page.

Is there a facility or agency to change those links and (inaudible).

MR. WASH: We're having trouble hearing the question, Pete.

See if this one works.

MR. HEMPHILL: With regard to the links between databases and links to other, other pages and PURLS, when the information gets changed, the target of a reference gets changed, who's
responsible for maintaining those links, is it GPO, is it the agency that's responsible for feeding those links and where does cross-reference information and linkage information, where, where is it shown on this diagram?

MS. DALECKY: Are you specifically referring to the PURLS that GPO has --

MR. HEMPHILL: Not necessarily the PURLS, but as we were talking about other data bases and links to other databases and showing where those are at, if that, if that database changes, how does this, how does that link get changed in the FDsys and who's responsible for changing it?

MRS. RUSSELL: Can I make a quick statement on that, Selene, and then you can correct me if you think I'm wrong.

MS. DALECKY: Sure. Sure.

MRS. RUSSELL: Going back to what I was just saying to Ann, Pete, if it's DOE and we have a relationship with DOE and are relying on their data, then that responsibility for updating those links that are within information bridge stay with Walt and his staff and the same thing with NRM, if we
have that relationship.

I think where we don't have an agency that has that kind of commitment and resources and we've copied the information, then as we do with maintaining our own PURLS, more of that responsibility falls on us to constantly validate those and to have an ability to fall back on the copy that we have ourselves if the agency copy fails.

But if you want to answer that more specifically with respect to FDsys, because again I'm talking more about the policy framework, not the system operation, so.

MR. HEMPHILL: Let me kind of clarify a little bit more about what I'm getting at. We used to have to run scans of all of the cross-reference links for all of the different information that we had to determine what links had dropped out and notify those agencies that they have changed their information and they need to change related references and other documents so that they point to the appropriate site and get the appropriate information back and that, that entailed developing
basically a system for acquisition to go out and pull that information back in so those links, links remain current.

Many times the agencies will change their, their site and that target changes in the other related documents.

MS. DALECKY: Judy, did you have anything to add?

MRS. RUSSELL: Only that I think that is a very reasonable functionality and it's a benefit that we have potentially to offer back to the agencies, just as we were talking about the value this community provides in helping us QC.

I mean obviously in the perfect world we would have no errors and we would find them all ourselves, but it is not a perfect world and given our relationship with the publishing agencies, obviously if we can identify things like that that help them know that by changing one document they need to update three or four others, that can become another close tie to them that gives them a benefit for the effort they're making to put information in our system.
MS. DALECKY: Yes, and we do have some limited ability right now to do, you know, run reports to do link checking and we do the PURLS check reports to make sure that the links that we have are still active. And so we do foresee the need to do that because we are continuing to have, to create links to documents and create -- or on, or to these databases that we were talking about within the ILS cataloging records, and so we are still, going to continue creating these persistent names and persistent links and need to make sure that those are valid.

MR. SUDDUTH: One last question, council, anybody, council?

MR. DUKES: Mark Dukes, the College of Worster.

I realize I'm not comparing apples with apples here, but we've had discussion about databases not being incorporated into FDsys at this point and then thinking in terms of Web harvesting, I realize it's not the same kind of database that I'm talking about, but as Websites become more database driven, is the -- and part of this is a
lack of, a full understanding on my part, as websites become more database driven, is it possible for the Web harvesting to be able to get at the documents or publications that are there to then be incorporated into the FDsys?

MR. LANDGRAF: This is Matt Landgraf.

(Speak in the microphone.)

MR. LANDGRAF: Okay, this is Matt Landgraf with the Program Management Office. There are capabilities built into the requirements for the harvester in later releases to basically be able to harvest content within databases as needed.

Obviously, you know, what we end up harvesting from databases and the extent that we duplicate the content within databases would be more of a policy decision, but for FDsys, the harvester should have that capability in the future. You'll hear more about that in the next session.

MR. SUDDUTH: And I think that's probably an excellent transition to lunch and reason to come back at 1:30 p.m. because the session will be on Web harvesting.

Thank you.
(Lunch recess taken at 12:05 p.m.)

MR. SUDDUTH: In the Columbia -- in the Columbia foyer there is Government documents, blogs. In, there's serial set in Columbia A, Columbia B is pre and post fire recovery and also Ben's guide and, where are we at, okay.

And where is our session? Okay.
All right. Let's go ahead and get started. This is council session on Web harvesting and our presenters will be Matt Landgraf and Kathryn Brazee and I will turn it over and let them start.

MR. LANDGRAF: Thank you very much and thank everyone here for coming to the session and allowing me to come and talk to everyone. This has been a pretty exciting project and it's the first step towards something that we're really looking forward to, so I wanted to thank everybody for showing interest.

Just an overview of what we're going to do today, first, Kathy and I, myself and Kathy Brazee, you can stand up, Kathy, introduce yourself, we're going to do a brief Power Point presentation, maybe 25 or 30 minutes or so and give you sort of the overview on the harvesting pilot so far and sort of how everything has gone.

And then we'll open it up to discussion, first with council, we have some questions prepared for council and then we'll do a general session of question and answer and hopefully we can generate some lively debate.
So, the Power Point presentation is basically we're going to start with sort of an overview of background information on why the project was started and sort of where it fits within the overall strategy of FDsys. And then go into an overview of the history, the process we followed and the results of the pilots in general.

We'll then go into some lessons learned and some next steps, sort of what's next for the program.

Okay. So, starting with the, with the background of the project, basically everybody here knows the obligation that GPO and the FDLP have to disseminate official information from the Government and make it publicly accessible forever. As everyone knows, this is more of a challenge as we get into the digital age, less things are being printed and subsequently, things are more and more published directly to a, to Federal agency Websites and sometimes GPO isn't made aware of these publications as they're, as they're being published.

So, and we have a goal of a comprehensive collection for the FDLP and that's
really, that's really the main driver behind the harvesting initiative.

So what's the solution? We're looking to have some sort of automated Web harvesting technologies that can discover, assess and harvest official content from Federal agency Websites that are within the scope of GPO dissemination programs.

Now this means not only to go out and discover this information, but to actually assess whether the, whether the information that is found on the agency Websites is within scope of GPO's dissemination programs. And we'll talk a little bit more later about some of the rules that have been used to configure the harvesters in order to do this, but it's really about gathering in scope content.

Just to give you an idea of where this activity, where we see this activity fitting within FDsys, as you know, there's three different types of content that we see feeding FDsys, you have converted content, you have basically scanned publications --
MR. LANDGRAF: -- scanned legacy publications, you have deposited content, content that we get directly from Federal agencies either through the printing process or otherwise, and then you have the idea of harvested content, which obviously that's why we're here.

The harvesting tools will be built as a, the overall comprehensive harvesting solution for GPO will be built as a part of FDsys.

We see three tools that the harvester will be comprised of, and these are, you know, these could mainly be conceptual, as well. It doesn't necessarily mean it's three different technologies that are performing these functions.

You have discovery tools, and these are the tools that go out and basically discover content. This is achieved right now mainly through like Web crawler technologies. Then you have assessment tools, this is where the rules come in. This is using rules to determine whether a content that's found is within scope of GPO dissemination programs, especially the FDLP.
And we'll get more into what those rules entail later on, but this is, this is really where those rules are applied. Then once the content is determined to be in scope, you have something called harvesting tools and harvesting tools do just that, they harvest the content, actually harvest an actual copy of the content so it can be brought into the system. So that's sort of the, the way we see that working with FDsys.

So, just to give you a little bit of background on where the pilot began, I was in the, I was in the position at -- first, actually before FDsys started I was, I was actually working on this project when I was in the information dissemination area, so this is, it's been great to see this project sort of evolve and sort of align with FDsys into sort of the long-term goals of the agency.

But GPO has long realized that this has been, that the issue of fugitive documents has been a major problem over the years and it's been a growing problem.

And this also isn't the first time that GPO has done some form of harvesting. The GPO
library services and content management division has been doing sort of manual crawling of different Websites over, over the last few years where, you know, catalogers and specialists from those areas will go through with a Web browser and actually point and click and find publications that way.

There's also been some semi-automated harvesting going on at GPO as well using certain tools to sort of bring in content, but, and those have worked pretty well up until now, but we've realized the need to actually apply more rules and get a more comprehensive harvesting solution in with, with FDsys.

And this is, you know, basically comes back to the, to the idea of only gathering in scope content.

So, to that end, you know, we realized that we needed help, you know, that there wasn't -- we, we needed to have basically some industry leaders come in and help us with these, with these activities. And we figured the best way to start was to basically conduct a pilot to have somebody come in, bring their technologies and sort of, and
sort of do a test run on the, on a Website.
So we developed a statement of work and went out with a request for proposals and before we went out with this, we ensured that all the goals and objectives of the RFP aligned with the goals and objectives of FDsys, so it was really sort of a first learning towards, towards what was going in, towards what was going into FDsys.
The RFP was released in, about

October 2005. We received a lot of proposals, there was a lot of interest in this, in this project throughout the community and it included many leading companies in the, in automated harvesting technologies. We selected two companies and the contract awards were made in early 2006.

So we selected two companies, Information International Associates and Blue Angel Technologies. Both in their proposals and in their past performance demonstrated a great understanding of sort of the issues that we were grappling with and pretty much everything that we were doing. So we were, we were very pleased to have them come in and do these, and do these pilots for us.
We've decided to do two pilots basically to allow us to compare different technologies and different methodologies that each vendor would bring to the table. Both companies actually did this simultaneously, but they did not do them together. They actually did them completely separate.

The results of each pilot were kept completely separate and that was done intentionally so that we could sort of compare the results and the methodologies that were employed.

So the pilot agency that we selected to do for this pilot was, was the EPA Website. Why did we select the EPA Website? Well, there's several reasons.

From the beginning we've had a good working relationship with EPA and they expressed interest in us doing this kind of work. And through these conversations we actually had a good indication that many EPA pubs were being missed. We also knew a pretty good deal about the EPA Website from some of the manual crawling that we had done, so we decided it was a good idea to go with the EPA.
Website.

Just to give you a little bit indication of what the schedule was, like I said, we made an award in early 2006. And the pilots began around April 2006 and actually contractor work was just, was just completed a few weeks ago and we're still in the process of reviewing the results.

We have some preliminary results to show you today, but we're still in the process of doing sort of the comprehensive review of the results. And basically their key deliverables, they were to conduct three separate crawls of the EPA Website. Now some of the deliverables that they had to, that they were to deliver were rules that determined whether, whether the EPA -- were the publication they found were in scope. There was the comparison of the harvested collection that we got from the pilots with our existing cataloging records and of course they delivered all of the EPA content and meta data that they determined to be within scope to us.

A little bit of information about the process that was followed. A cross-functional team
within GPO was assembled consisting of PMO staff and acquisitions areas, catalogers, and people in the, in the library planning area. It was a really, a really good team that was really able to analyze a lot of results.

GPO -- when the project started, GPO provided basically a criteria and parameters document, which is a -- Kathy will explain a little bit more about what that document entailed, but that was sort of their starting ground, the contractor's starting ground for writing rules and instructions that the harvester would use to determine scope. I'll let Kathy talk a little bit more about that when she comes up here.

But based on the information that the GPO provided, the contractor's rules that determine whether content was in scope and then using those rules, once those rules were approved by GPO, they crawled and harvested content and meta data, so any kind of meta data that was associated with, with the publications on the site, they harvested those, as well.

Now, after each crawl, this is the
reason that we did three crawls, but after three
crawls -- after each crawl, the rules and
instructions were refined by the contractors based
on a detailed analysis conducted by GPO after each
crawl. We did basically random sampling of the
crawls, of each one of the crawls and basically gave
them a preliminary accuracy rate between each one of
the crawls as to how accurate they could be in
determining scope.

So, based on that information we gave
them and more information that they could glean from
us in conference calls, they basically tweaked and
re-wrote rules between crawls so that they could
improve over, over the three-crawl process.

Now, you know, we see this sort of
process continuing. We know the rules will never be
perfect and they are also going to be, you know,
they are going to evolve a lot over time as content
changes over time, so we just wanted to test to see
how well these rules could be applied and whether
they can be sort of like customized for each agency.

Along with content that just resides on
Web pages, we actually identified a few core-based
data based on the EPA Website that we wanted the contractors to take a look at as well. We identified, I believe it was three in the second crawl and seven in the third crawl, so, so we did do a little bit of testing, a little preliminary testing as to how well content can be, can be harvested and scope can be determined within EPA database.  

I'm going to turn it over to Kathy now who's going to talk a little bit about the, the contractor methodologies and the rules and some of the pilot results.

MS. BRAZEE: Thank you, Matt. Hello again.

Backing up just one step to talk a little bit about the parameters document, I just wanted to give you a sense of what we actually asked the vendors to crawl. We asked them to find EPA publications and their associated meta data and these are, for this project are those that EPA publishes, disseminates or makes available to the public. These publications can be in any language, in any form or format and in any location on
20 official Web pages, including deep Websites.
21 Excludes those internal use only work in progress kind of documents that may be actually on the public
22 Internet and also excludes those subject to official
0166 use of security classification restrictions and
0166 those constrained by privacy considerations.
4 Included are publications created as a
5 result of a contractor grant. We figured that some
6 of these are going to be off the EPA.gov domain. We
7 wanted to see what the crawler could do in terms of
8 finding these publications and EPA publications
9 re-posted on unofficial Websites were actually not
10 part of the parameters of this pilot, so if an
11 agency such as a State environmental protection
12 agency took an EPA publication and re-posted it on
13 their Website, that was not part of, part of
14 something that we wanted to harvest, assuming that
15 that EPA publication is likely to be on the EPA.gov
16 Website elsewhere and of course different versions
17 or editions of publications were included in the
18 pilot.
19 Now to the IIA contractor methodologies,
20 both vendors actually followed the process that Matt
described in the previous slide. I thought we'd just give you an overview, a very high-level overview of the differences. Both vendors used their own crawlers and they built their own filtering algorithms to identify the publications in scope.

The IIA vendor actually has a significant amount of experience with the Environmental Protection Agency Website. They actually have a very close working relationship with the EPA, so that was actually an interesting advantage for them or an interesting part of this pilot.

Before their first crawl they spent a significant amount of time asking us questions about in scope publications and sending us URLs from the EPA Website and asking us to determine if some publications were in scope or not. And we gave them feedback and they built their preliminary set of rules based on this data and their observations as well of what they know about the EPA Website. So a major focus for them was categorization of content and development of the rules associated with these
And after the first crawl, they did a substantial amount of analysis using a PURLS program that they developed using GPO feedback and the data collected by the crawler, they analyzed the content for patterns of key terms and content characteristic. They actually said in their final report that for a single document, an average of nine rules were true.

The rules applied to, of course, different documents in that the majority or about two-thirds of the rules that were generated before the first crawl were portable to other agencies.

Matt's going to talk a little bit more about how the rules can be applied to different agencies, but as a result of IIA's analysis after their first and second crawls, very substantial analysis of the results, they developed some system-generated rules as well and that accounted to about one-third of the rules for the second and third crawls and those are less portable to the other agencies because they are more specific to the EPA Website and to EPA publications.
They also found that rules, what they call positive rules were more effective than negative rules, the rules that identified something as a publication in scope rather than identified what content is not in scope were more effective.

Blue Angel is the other vendor. They had less experience with the EPA Website going into the pilot. They focused on, especially in the third crawl, excluding types of public documents that are out of scope for the pilot. They developed a whole list of categories, things like abstracts, consent forms, fragments of publications, instructions, internal memos, solicitations, survey forms. All of these things were not publication deemed to be in scope of the FDLP and GPO's information dissemination programs.

Now remember the other vendor said that positive rules were more effective for them, so it's going to be an interesting project for us to review these two concepts and how they were applied.

And Blue Angel also focused on key words in specific sections of documents, focused on
whether or not there was something in the meta data
or something in the front matter, in their case it's
the first 250 words of a Website or a document and
elsewhere on the Website.

Now this is just going to give you a
very high level overview of the rules which are
obviously very specific and technical, but this is a
generalization of what rules are that show that
something on a Web page is a document in an in scope
publication.

Excluded are things that are draft
forms, not something like a draft environmental
impact statement, which is a final publication, but
a draft work in progress. Something like an
internal memo, somebody's notes about a meeting that
are not part of an official conference for seating,
things like purchase orders, statements of work,
things that are more internal publications, internal
use publications to an agency.

Included are documents that contained
specific words or phrases such as a chapter,
appendix, technical report, et cetera, that indicate
the content is a publication. We gave the vendors
about 150 words or phrases that might indicate that
something on a Web page is a content -- a
publication in scope and we gave them about 100
words or so in Spanish because EPA has such a strong
Spanish presence on their Website.

Of course they have a significant amount
of other publications in other languages, but that
was just a starting point for them to get a sense of
what we thought would help identify a publication
that's in scope. And of course link analysis
following a link from a chapter of a publication to
another chapter of a publication, just to make sure
we get the entire resource. And then of course want
to look for anything that shows that publication is
authored by an official U.S. Government agency,
which may not be as straightforward as it sounds
because there are a lot of other agency publications
on the EPA Website.

So we also had to determine if something
was an EPA publication, of course, on their Website.
Excluded any documents that did not include a
reference to EPA as an author or something in,
somewhere on the publication and not necessarily a
traditional publication that has the title and the statement of responsibility, but something that actually says something on the page that it is authored by EPA or issued by EPA if it's a contracted publication.

There were several publications that were only partially included on the EPA Website, being that EPA has a strong regulatory function, there were parts of the Federal Register and parts of the CFR referenced on the Website and those were not in scope of the pilot because they were not EPA publications and there were also only parts of publications.

And of course anything with a title, author, statement of responsibility, et cetera, a description that something is authored by EPA is an EPA publication.

Okay, these are very preliminary results of the third crawl, but it just gives you an idea of the number of documents we found. And we're talking about documents, these are entire publications or parts of publications because they represent, they can represent chapters or appendices or something
that is just part of a publication.

And Blue Angel found 83,229 documents in
the third crawl and our preliminary estimate is that
the accuracy rated this the number of publications
that are -- number of documents, actually, excuse
me, that are in scope is between 70 and 75 percent.

We also have a list of publications that
were deemed out of scope. The crawlers first found
publications and then they applied rules to
determine whether or not it was an EPA publication,
so we also want to go through those groups of out of
scope publications to see if there are any resources
there that are, in fact, EPA publications.

And Blue Angel had significantly more
out of scope I believe than IIA in scope, relatively
speaking, so we definitely want to take a close look
at those because again, Blue Angel had a lot of
rules that excluded certain types of content from
their, from their results.

Now IIA, again, very preliminary
results, found 239,478 documents and we estimate
very preliminary review of the third crawl results
that this is between 75, 70 to 75 percent accurate.
And their rules tended to be a bit more expansive, so the reason I think very preliminary reason for the difference between the two results is that IIA had significantly more depth I think to their rules and just had more content that it found as a result of the rules.

I'm going to turn it back over to Matt, but before I do that I just wanted to share one of my major lessons learned. I believe that you'll appreciate this.

The vendors have recommended that we build a database of documents that are in and out of scope. Now of course the CGP represents publications that are in scope, we don't have a similar base for public -- or documents that are out of scope, so it's going to take a different kind of thinking to document these things and to build a database.

Obviously various, but for rules testing we gave the vendors a preliminary small list to begin with that we think or I think, at least, the team is yet to agree on this, to build a little bit larger list. And it's going to be tricky in some
cases because how do we distinguish between a draft, like a draft environmental impact statement, or a
draft work in progress or something that is a
meeting minutes document posted by somebody who
attended the meeting that's completely unofficial
versus a conference proceedings publication like our
calendar proceedings, or something like a personal
contact page for an individual at an agency versus
something that is an agency directory, telephone
directory, for example.

So there's some interesting results and
Matt's going to tell you a little bit more about
those.

MR. LANDGRAF: Thank you, Kathy. The
slide I'm showing now basically gives you sort of an
overall, an overall picture of sort of how the
results improved from one crawl to another.

As you see, we were down around maybe
55 percent accuracy in the first crawl and it
really, it went up to anywhere between, we're
estimating between 70 and 85 percent accuracy after
the third crawl, so this really proved to us that
the methodology was at least somewhat correct in
that we really, what we really were able to improve
the rules and instructions as they learned more and
more about scope.

As Kathy said, this is, these are
estimates, these are very preliminary numbers.
There is, there's sort of a range that's associated
with each, so these aren't exact numbers. I just
wanted to sort of show that we had a steady incline
of in scope publications.

And this also only represents the, the
samples that we took of documents that the harvester
determined to be in scope and then our determination
of whether that, they actually were in scope. This,
this doesn't, this doesn't give us any, any insight
into the population that they found to be out of
scope where, you know, there may be some in scope
content in there.

However, I can tell you that the results
of the first two crawls basically drove home that we
hadn't really been missing too much in scope
content. When we went through those out of scope
samples, we hadn't been missing too much in scope
content. I think the last, the last error rate that
we saw in the second crawl was less than 10 percent.

So, to go into some lessons learned, as Kathy started to talk about, there's a lot of rules that, that were written that can be aggregated in order to be, in order to be used for, for crawling and harvesting and determining scope of content on other agency Web pages.

There's a certain amount of those, but there's also a certain amount of customization that's going to need to happen between each one of those, between each one of those things. We don't have, we don't have a great estimate yet as to how, how many of these rules can be aggregated and how many can be, and how many need to be customized, but we know that there's going to be a certain level of that and that will be part of the analysis that we do in the, in the coming weeks.

The second, as you may imagine, it's been difficult to mimic the subjective scope decision that's been made with objective rules. As you saw above, we've gotten, you know, some pretty good results considering there's been no human intervention in that at all other than writing the
rules. I mean 75 and 85 percent I think we still consider to be pretty good and we think this number can improve, but there may be sort of a point of diminishing returns there, as well.

Another lessons learned is that publications that are in certain file formats, things like PDF and Microsoft Office files that are sort of self-contained, self-contained publications, they are a lot more easily harvested and harvested accurately and in their entirety than those in HTML. I know we had numerous errors in the, in the harvested content where there would be, you know, missing links, links wouldn't go to the right places or there would be, you know, some missing graphics and things like that, things that I think can be solved, but there's, there's definitely a lot more to be learned about harvesting some of these HTML pages.

Also, publications that are comprised of multiple files proved to be a challenge in that it was difficult to write rules that related to the various pieces of the publication together. You know, a lot of the publications that we found on the
EPA Website were basically within an HTML directory, so you'd have chapter one on one page, chapter two on the next page, so you'd have, you know, 25 different files that, that comprise this publication and both companies actually found it pretty difficult to try to package those together in an automated fashion to make one publication.

We asked them to start to write rules for it and they did and they basically flagged the publications that should be related together, but there's, there's more work that needs to be done there, as well.

Some other open issues, there's the, the ideas of precision and comprehensiveness. Both of them are important issues to consider here obviously, but you know, you can write rules and configure the harvester to bring in only in scope content, basically making the rules, you know, much, much more strict to bring in only in scope content, but you run the risk of missing in scope content if you do that.

And then if you go to the other extreme, if you make it so flexible that you're bringing
everything in, you have a problem with a lot of out
of scope publications. Now we basically found that
the pilots have fallen basically someplace in
between these two extremes.

As you saw before, we've gotten anywhere
between 70 and 85 percent accuracy and an initial
sampling has revealed that about a 10 percent rate
of in scope content was excluded, so I think we're
doing pretty good to get the balance between those
two.

As far as methodologies going forward,
we need to make the decision of whether GPO should
be building a tool in-house or purchase a tool and
actually run the harvester in-house or whether it
should be a service that, that should be contracted
outside. The pilots were basically conducted by the
pilots on site at their facilities, they weren't
brought in to GPO and they ran into a lot of
constraints, even, even on their servers and as far
as their bandwidths goes.

Actually, the harvests took a lot longer
than we thought they would initially, you know,
since some of the crawls had taken, you know,
depending on how comprehensive and how many databases there were, they could have taken three weeks to do these crawls, which was a little bit, a little bit longer than we had anticipated.

(End Track 7 on CD.)

(Beginning Track 8 on CD.)

MR. LANDGRAF: So some next steps. As I said, we're still in the process of evaluating the results of the pilot and we'll be coming out with a report that, that basically will give a full analysis of the results sometime in November and this will be, this will be a further analysis of in scope and out of scope content.

It will be analysis of the comparison analysis between GPO records and the content that we harvested. It will be an assessment of the meta data that was received with each one of the publications and of course the recommendations for the next steps and, you know, where GPO should go from here.

Just a few things that we know now outside of the report that we'll need to do. We'll
need to continue, continue to review and compare results of pilots and projects that sort of have a similar mission. There's a few at the end of projects that especially we would want to look at.

And we also really, you know, based on the lessons learned and based on everything or based on some of the open issues that we have, we basically decided that we'll need to do some more testing which, which will, which will probably mean another pilot with another agency Website that will test what we've done so far and then sort of put some new methodologies towards it.

Of course the, just to give you the long-term view of what we're doing, what we're going to be doing with harvesting over the next couple of years, the knowledge gained from the pilots that we're doing right now will be leveraged and will be incorporated into requirements and specifications that will be implemented with the future digital system.

As far as, as far as the content that we got from the pilot as you saw, we got, you know, 83 to 240,000 documents from the pilot. As far as
that goes, our goal is to, is to, is to try to
catalog in scope publications from this pilot,
starting with the, with the comparison between what
we've harvested and what, and our cataloging records
so that we're not dealing with any duplicate
content.

But then also, you know, between now and
FDsys, and while these, while we're learning about
these technologies and methodologies, GPO is going
to continue to, continue to identify and harvest
publications in, in the same ways that I've, that
I've told you about earlier.

So I'm just going to run through the
assumptions real quick and then, and then we'll ask
the questions of counsel and start our discussion.

The first is GPO will use discovery,
assessment and harvesting tools to identify, gather
and capture official publications for PURL agency
Websites. The second is the harvesting function
will be performed by GPO internally or an outside
contractor or a combination of the two.

The third is Federal agencies will
expect GPO to notify them that we're crawling or
harvesting publications from their Websites. And the fourth is the harvester will be implemented in conjunction with FDsys.

The harvesting function will retrieve content and meta data necessary to create a package for ingest. You heard us talk a little bit about submission packages for ingest into FDsys, we're looking for the harvester to assist greatly in that, especially getting minimum meta data that will be required by FDsys.

Harvesting activities will also follow best practices to ensure that, that the GPO and target servers aren't put at risk in terms of security and bandwidths, terms of like security and bandwidth. We've gotten that concern from a few content originators.

So with that I guess I'll open up to discussion questions for council. The first question I would have is, the assumptions that we went over, are they correct with respect to Web harvesting?

MRS. RUSSELL: Matt, I think at this point we want to turn it back over to Bill to sort
of moderate the Q and A. If you would stay there by
the mic, because I assume there will be questions
for you and Kathy.

MR. LANDGRAF: Sure, no problem.

MR. SUDDUTH: Actually what I'd like to
do first is ask if council has any questions about
what you presented before we get into these set

MR. WARNICK: Yes, I have a number of
questions. This is Walt Warnick from the Department
of Energy.

Do you have any sense at all about how
these documents you found compare to the documents
that you already have access to through GPO?

In other words, the 239,000, have you
done any sampling or anything at all to give you a,
some kind of a hint of what fraction of these were
already included in GPO so we know about how many of
these are really fugitive?

MR. LANDGRAF: Yes, actually the last
task of the pilot was for them to use automated
tools to, to make a determination based on our
cataloging records of whether they had actually,
whether we've actually catalogued and whether we
have -- (inaudible) out of control over those
publications.

So, that was the last task and of course
there's, there's going to have to be a lot of, a lot
of manual work that's going to need to be done with
that as well before we, before we do. That just to
make sure we avoid any duplication.

MR. WARNICK: What was the answer, I
mean 10 percent, 90 percent, what?

MR. LANDGRAF: We're actually still in
the process of evaluating those results right now.
I don't, I don't think we really have any
preliminary numbers on that yet.

MR. WARNICK: Okay, I think that is an
extremely important metric to judge the value of
this project, I mean if you have 90 some percent of
these documents already, it's probably not
worthwhile. If you have 5 percent of them already,
then you've hit a gold mine.

MR. LANDGRAF: I'd agree.

MR. WARNICK: The fraction of documents
out of scope from my point of view as a systems
Your best example was 15 to 25 percent of the documents you found were out of scope, then I certainly would not want to, that would be a red flag. I would never go forward with anything like that and I think that your approach is really, my own personal judgment is unlikely to get that fraction down to, out of scope documents, get that fraction down to an acceptable level.

I think there are other approaches, other companies have already demonstrated far higher success rates, harvesting collections far larger than the EPA collection and, and actually such things that, such systems have been demonstrated for GPO before.

I have, not aware that they've been demonstrated for you, probably not, and I encourage you to, you know, if you're going to do another pilot, that you talk to people who have actually done this successfully and get their, get their success.

I think you'd be amazed at how cheap, how inexpensive doing this right is and I'll be
happy to talk with you about that off line.

MR. LANDGRAF: Great.

MR. WARNICK: So, I certainly, the idea of doing another pilot sounds to me to be right on track, but I think you might have to take a different approach than you've taken so far.

MRS. RUSSELL: Walt, I think one of the things that you have to keep in mind and you know this as well as we do being in a Government agency, this was a competitive process and there were a number of companies who bid, including some of those whom you previously brought to our attention, but who did not, were not successful in the competition. So whatever we do going forward is still going to be constrained by that need for competition.

MR. WARNICK: Yeah, it's kind of amazing that companies who have already done this for far larger systems with a far higher success rate did not succeed in the competition. You have to wonder about that competition.

MR. LANDGRAF: I think it's a great point and I think there's a lot of like information
sharing and lessons learned that can happen between a lot of these different projects that are going on and I think that, I think now that we have some results to bring to the table, I think that would be good to start that conversation.

MS. STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina Stierholz from the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. I was wondering if the publications in the two different pilots were the same? Is that a, is it a one-to-one thing for the documents and what was the difference in what you found in the two different groups?

MR. LANDGRAF: It probably wasn't a one-to-one, it wasn't, probably wasn't a complete one-to-one comparison between the two and that's also a lot of what we need to do as far as our next steps as well, is really compare the two and see how much overlap there was. But we know, that we know that there was a little bit of divergence into how deeply one vendor got into the EPA Website than the other, so we know there's a little bit of divergence there, but we want to make sure that we understand that.
I think that there is going to be a significant amount of overlap, but we need to delve further into the results to really get that, get that indication.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill. I have a question with regard to the numbers, I'm not sure I'm understanding correctly.

Was this the same site that was crawled between the two different companies, because if you received 239,000 from one and what was it, 85,000 or 83,000 on the other with less than a 10 percent deviation on the rate, what, what gives?

MR. LANDGRAF: Yeah, I think that's, that's a very good point. I think it goes back to what I was just saying to Katrina is that, is that I believe that there was a divergence into how deeply both vendors got into the EPA Website, but there was also, there's also, you know, a possibility that there could be a larger divergence in the accuracy rates than what we have.

We've done an initial sample, but I think that those issues will become a lot more clear once we are able to sample a lot more.
MR. HEMPHILL: Okay, and the second question is how does GPO plan to handle those documents that were missed from being out of scope or in scope that were missed? How do you, how do you find what you don't know is there?

MR. LANDGRAF: You mean documents that were missed by the pilot that were deemed to be out of scope; is that what you mean?

MR. HEMPHILL: Right.

MR. WARNICK: Well, I think that this, don't get me wrong, I think that while I'm not all that complimentary about the effort that's been made, exerted so far, I think that the goal here is absolutely marvelous in that, you know, estimating the number of fugitive documents not available to GPO right now, and there's estimates all over the map, that the most optimistic estimates I've heard are 50 percent. I think the number is more like 75 or 80 percent of documents exist that are unknown to GPO, so if they can make a significant dent in that 75 to 80 percent that's unknown, that's a huge step in the right direction, even if there's still a remaining 10 or 20 percent fugitives left over after
they get done.

MR. HEMPHILL: I didn't realize it was that high, currently.

Thank you.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other preliminary questions from council?

Okay, then we can get to the discussion questions. The first one is are the assumptions correct with respect to Web harvesting?

MRS. RUSSELL: Can you switch back to the assumptions slide, Matt, that would help.

MR. LANDGRAF: Okay.

MRS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MS. MILLER: This is Ann, and I'm -- Miller, document, whatever. I need my caffeine. I think it's what Walt said, I think the assumptions is, or the assumptions about Web harvesting is absolutely spot on. I mean that's where we're losing stuff and if GPO has got to start doing it and so I think this is a no-brainer. I, I think -- I yield to Walt's greater understanding of the accuracy of and the count and so on, but I, I
agree with him that this is a marvelous first step.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other discussion on this? Council?

MRS. RUSSELL: There are two slides with the subject, and we're only able to see one at a time, so you may want to flip back and forth in your handout.

MS. PARKER: Let me, this is Marian Parker.

Let me ask for a clarification, when you said you'd have the competitive process and you chose two vendors and you may go through another pilot, will you have a competitive process again to choose?

MR. LANDGRAF: Yes, I think it will have to be a competitive process.

MS. PARKER: And in the Federal Government procurement system, are you always required to take the lowest bidder despite -- okay, you've got other factors that can weigh into it, too.

MRS. RUSSELL: No, we can do what's called a best value selection and obviously a lot of
what is controlling is how well we write the statement of work. So we actually had a statement of work out and then pulled it back and revised it and re-submitted it so that there were actually two cycles of bidding before we awarded and obviously the next statement of work will be very much informed by what we've learned here. And so it probably will be a significantly improved statement of work even over the one we initially used.

MR. LANDGRAF: And just to add on to that, this was a best value, this was a best value contract and we actually took a lot of time to write the evaluation criteria on how we would select these vendors and weighed those criteria to make sure that we're getting, that we got what was most important to us.

MR. SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth. Again, looking at the preliminary numbers and again, I think that there's, you've got to go dig deeper into this, but if you say that one vendor has prior experience with that agency's Web presence and they on the first blush of things draws three times the amount, given what you
go back and see if there's duplication and other rules were either done, violated or misinterpreted, then I would think that you would end up writing a statement of work that says, that would give a vendor who has experience with that, with a particular agency's Web presence might be an advantage.

So, I mean, but this is, you know, that's just taking off the top of the fluff right here. I mean I'm afraid, I mean I again would, you know, defer to Walt, but I mean these numbers here seem so easy to misinterpret, you know, no matter which way you cut it.

MS. MILLER: This is Ann Miller again. I have a, I have a, a question about the assumptions here that there, there doesn't seem to be any of those, you know, subjective human elements in here that -- is there a plan? Can I make an assumption that there will be sort of human checks and balances on this process so that we're not just letting the machine go off and assume that it's always doing it correctly, that there's going to be, you know, spot checking and assessment and perhaps if we notice
that whichever, whatever product that ends up a
combination of products that ends up doing this,
that if there's a flag that we will have an option
for humans to go in and check the site on their, you
know, as a, a spot check?

MR. LANDGRAF: It's most certainly a
requirement for a capability of the harvester with
FDsys that, yes, things can be flagged for manual
follow-up. Absolutely it is a capability that we
intend to put into the harvester.
I don't know if Ric or Judy has anything
to add to that.

MR. WARNICK: I could add something to
it. The difference between this approach that
you've seen here and approaches that actually work
involve human input up front. You don't just turn
the machine on and go away for a week and come back.
The people who know what the scope means
are involved in telling the crawler where to crawl
and where not to crawl. And that's, that's the
difference in approach and I think the results speak
for themselves.

MR. LANDGRAF: And once again, I think
that's a good opportunity for us to talk more and see if we can leverage some of the learning that both of us have done.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other discussion on this question?

MR. SWINDELLS: Is that just on assumption one, are we going through in order?

MR. SUDDUTH: I was going through the questions in order.

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay, well then I do have a comment on one of the assumptions.

Assumption number five on retrieving content and meta data, I sort of have a question and a comment. Let me do the comment first, get that out of the way.

I was very interested in how important at least it seemed from your presentation, for how important document type or genre characteristics were to the success of the harvesting and interestingly, genre is one of the least well represented elements in our current cataloging reference. And there is a lot of research showing that in terms of large-scale findings on the Web,
really looking through vast amounts of information, genre can play an increasingly important part in narrowing searches. So I think that if, if these crawls can provide genre information back into FDsys, I think that would be very useful.

Now my question, though, is have you looked at the meta data and can you tell us anything about what it looked like, what kind of quality there was, how you, how you see, you know, how much work will be involved in, in getting that meta data into shape.

MR. LANDGRAF: That's a great question and I, we've, we've done sort of a high level sort of scouring of the meta data that we've received in the project and as expected, I suppose, the meta data that we've been able to find has been fairly minimal, but there's a lot of things, you know.

The FDsys requirements that we've, that we've developed for creating a compliant submission package have intentionally been left to the, to the most essential elements of a document object that would need to be captured at the time of harvest and I think we're pretty confident that we could get
those, you know, we can get, you know, of course
date and time of harvest, we can always get line
type, we can get, for the most part, we can get, we
can get title, we can get, you know, originating
agency if we have a targeted Website.

So, I think that we've, what we've,
there are still some work that needs to be done,
there's still some analysis that we need to do, but
I think initially we've, we've found the meta data
to be, to be pretty minimal, but probably, probably
ample for what we'll need.

But, like I said, that's just a
preliminary, a preliminary assessment.

MR. WARNICK: Of course the future
digital system, you know, it, right now it's, the
initial thing is supposed to be trodded out
August 31st, 2007, promises to handle documents and
other things that agencies hand to GPO on a silver
platter. I mean that's, and whereas these -- items
here found through a harvester are not like that at
all.

And so the idea that you're going to
have all the meta data that you ever want about
these documents, that's a dream and it's an unrealizable dream and it's not worth anybody, any single humans or group of human's effort to produce all that meta data because I don't think there's that many people that GPO can get its hands on to provide that meta data.

On the other hand with the information that you get from a harvester, the documents can be retrieved, they can be searched and they can be retrieved which is a heck of a lot better than if you don't even know about them in the first place. So there's got to be some trade-off between the completeness of the meta data and the idea that you can actually find something in the first place.

MS. MILLER: Walt, can I ask you a question?

If, if they are retrieving that, is it, how easy is it to pull the existing meta data that might be behind any document and put it into, say, a FDsys data system so that it can be more automated?

MR. WARNICK: If the document happens to be an XML document, then you can get really complete meta data in a hurry. If it's an HTML document as
they pointed out, you've got a very significant challenge. So, it depends on the format to a large degree. So --

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill. Also, we've had experience with crawling and using meta data and Walt was absolutely correct when he says you won't be able to get all the meta data all the time. It's important that FDsys be able to handle that and there's an assumption that meta data is -- not all elements of meta data are going to be required for a document to be discoverable by a person doing a search.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any more questions?

I'm trying to get a sense of, are we comfortable with most of the assumptions or?

MR. SWINDELLS: Well, Bill, just on assumption number one, I mean it really depends on the success rate because will GPO use this. Well, if they have to spend enormous amounts of staff time manually checking, then the benefits won't be there, so I think it's an open question. I mean I think, yes, that's where we
should be going, but it will depend on a success rate that minimizes handling by staff.

MR. SUDDUTH: Let's go to the next question.

Let's see, a harvester can be configured to harvest only in scope publications or mostly in scope publications, including some out of scope publications, given the results of the pilot is the existing methodology sufficient to continue harvesting and let me, I want to jump in here, it says here given the results of the pilot and I don't think we have all the results and I don't want to, I, I mean I don't want to discuss much more until we have further results, I mean further analysis, so.

MR. HEMPHILL: I guess the answer that we really need is how much better is it than what we have now?

MR. LANDGRAF: And I think we were trying to get sort of an idea of, of sort of with whether the preliminary accuracy rates that we've reported are, are acceptable or whether, or whether they need to be, you know, sort of further refined or, you know, what is an acceptable level, that's
sort of the question that we wanted to sort of put on the table.

MR. WARNICK: Well I'll repeat that from my own perspective as a manager of an information operation, I would consider these out of scope numbers to be unacceptable, but I think that is a function of your approach, not a function of the harvesting. I think harvesting has been proven to work and you can develop a, an information resource that does not have nearly that level of out of scope and I'll be happy to talk with you about alternative approaches privately.

MR. AKEROYD: Richard, this is Richard, this question is hard to answer for me because I think I heard as part of your presentation that you said you were looking to do another pilot and so to me I could answer this question maybe a little better after the next pilot.

But listening to some of the reservations that Walt has, I really wonder if you really shouldn't be going back and restructuring this whole thing. It sounds, it just sounds a little too iffy to me right now.
MS. MILLER: This is Ann Miller.
I'd add one more thing from a very much
more general point of view is that if you're asking
me whether I only want in scope publications with
the chance that I'm going to lose in scope
publications or if I want all in scope publications
with the chance that I'm going to get some out of
scope publications which would mean, you know, I
might get a survey or I might get an internal memo,
I think my answer is, too, I would rather have all
in scope publications and deal with the (inaudible)
I mean this is kind of like selecting the general
publications item number is that I get a lot of
really good stuff, but then I get the, you know,
folded up and flied around the office model of the
space shuttle and I'm willing to do that because I
get all of it.
So I would say err on the side of
inclusiveness.

MRS. RUSSELL: That's helpful, Ann,
because that really is very much what we were trying
to get at and I think that same kind of question, I
think it goes back maybe to your comment, Geoff,
about what we could afford to do.

And so part of the question then is going to become the amount of time it might take, let's even just take the lower of the numbers, to review 83,000 documents to find 20, 15 percent that were out of scope compared to simply cataloging all of them, especially if we have an automated cataloging tool that's doing a fair amount of that so it's not manual, it may not be worth pulling them out.

I mean obviously in the best of all possible worlds what we'd love is 100 percent accuracy with nothing lost and no noise, but we knew going into this that there was going to be that trade-off about getting noise and that probably no matter how good it, was that we would find that we'd missed some things just out of a fluke or, you know, so.

MS. MILLER: Well, and who knows, I mean we may, if you're trolling, if you're harvesting EPA and you're getting the, the empty surveys of what they were asking industry to report, someone 25, 30, 40 years from now may want to know what was on that
survey form.

So, I mean trying to predict whether or not this is going to be useful to some of our, my primary clientele researchers is hard to say, that's why I'd really just rather have the noise, too, you know, if it's not too much noise. Obviously I don't want it to go too far.

MR. SWINDELLS: Well, I have a question about that, Ann. Geoff Swindells, University of Missouri, I did actually remember.

And that's sure, I, from, from my perspective, I want everything whether it's in scope or not. I think scope is too narrow, I always have, but are there not policy consequences to having large numbers of out of scope publications and what are those consequences and, you know, where, where is the error rate acceptable that doesn't require manual checking to get rid of them and I'm not sure where that line comes in.
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MR. SWINDELLS: Because if someone says GPO's collecting all these out of scope
publications, is that, does that become a problem at some point, I don't know.

    MS. MILLER: Well that's where, that's where we have, how do you define mostly and some.

    MR. SWINDELLS: Right. It's that line.

    MS. MILLER: You know, and that's what --

    UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's defined as anything better than what we have now.

    MS. MILLER: Well, there is that, too.

    MS. BRAZEE: I have a clarifying comment. Some of the out of scope documents that came back are not actually U.S. Government publications, they are from Websites like MarthaStewart.com or they are from --

    UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're not sure how that happened.

    MS. BRAZEE: That was in the first crawl. Or a lot of them are from State environmental agencies, so I just wanted to make that clarifying comment that the out of scope are not just EPA publications that are out of scope because they are internal works in progress, but
they are actually not U.S. Government publications, as well.

MR. HEMPHILL: One question I had that's related to whether assumptions are correct, I think there's an implicit assumption here that ongoing you'll be able to tell what's changed.

Is that going to be the case, was that part of the pilot, was that --

MR. LANDGRAF: It wasn't necessarily part of the pilot, but once again, those are, those are requirements that are sort of built in to the FDsys requirements. You're talking about ongoing harvesting, basically if you want to re-harvest the EPA Website in six months and figure out what's changed.

MR. HEMPHILL: Yeah.

MR. LANDGRAF: Yeah, that sort of capability is something that we'll definitely need to look at. It's not something really that the vendors looked at at this time, but I think it's something that will need to be incorporated into another pilot.

MR. HEMPHILL: I was just a little
concerned when you said it took three weeks to crawl
the Website.

MR. LANDGRAF: So were we.

MR. HEMPHILL: If you're trying to
update something and figure out what's changed,
you're going to be forever crawling that Website and
only have a three-week update period.

MRS. RUSSELL: Well, and let's be clear,
we keep saying Website as though it were one
Website, but it's, what, 23, 24 Websites operated by
various parts of EPA. So when you go to the EPA.gov
Website, there's a search all EPA Websites and
that's the scope of what we had given to our
vendors.

MR. LANDGRAF: Yeah, and I think the
preliminary number that we got from EPA before we
started the pilot was 700,000 HTML Web pages and
then that doesn't even include some of the documents
that we got from the, from the databases.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any more?

Okay. Then next question, what other
avenues regarding automated Web harvesting should
GPO be exploring in the future?
MR. LANDGRAF: I think we've heard a couple of these already, but.

MR. SUDDUTH: I'll repeat them.

MR. WARNICK: I assume you don't want me to run through that again?

MR. SUDDUTH: Yes, Richard.

MR. DAVIS: I guess I'm still a little bit troubled looking at this last assumption, harvesting activities will follow industry best practices, I'm out of my depth here, but I'm hearing Walt say something about the fact that evidently at least from his perspective, best practices have not been followed.

So let me ask another question. Judy, you said this is a competitive process and you have to go through that and I understand that. I think Walt went through that, too, and it is possible within the Federal Government structure to, that if one Federal agency has gone through a competitive process, found something that works, that another agency can borrow from that or does it necessarily have to be competitive again?

MRS. RUSSELL: Sometimes there's a
contract, for instance, that will come up in the cataloging session I think that Defense Technical Information Center has a contract with Old Dominion University for automated meta data harvesting from documents, from electronic documents and we have been able to join that DETECH procurement, in other words, we've added our own procurement and joined it.

So sometimes there's a vehicle like that, but that is not always the case. It depends on how the vehicle is structured and even a vendor who may have done a very good job for one agency may not have been responsive to our statement of work and, therefore, even though they might have been quite capable of doing it, if they hadn't documented that in their proposal, there's nothing we can do about it.

MR. LANDGRAF: Just a quick clarification on the spirit of that assumption, I think what we were trying to get at is we've, we've gotten some concern from, from several agencies, you know, when we've talked about harvesting to several agencies that we don't sort of interfere with their
Website and interfere with their bandwidth and, you
know, bring their Website down in certain cases if
we hit on their Website too hard. I think that's,
that that's a major concern for the agencies.
And security is also a concern as well,
so I think that was more the spirit as far as best
practices go, just to make sure that we're not being
too intrusive on Federal agency Websites while we're
doing this.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.
Could you possibly work with the
agency's Web master to have them exclude the items
that you know that are not out of -- that are out of
scope, certainly there's a way to do that and also
it would reduce their traffic and you wouldn't have
that problem, necessarily.

MR. LANDGRAF: I think that's certainly
a model that we should look at and we've gotten some
interest in some of the Web content managers groups
that we attend the meetings for sometimes, is that,
you know, they actually are pretty excited about the
idea that we're harvesting some of this in scope
content and a few have actually offered to sort of
give us hints as to which parts of the, of a Federal agency Website has the most in scope content or publications that we might want.

So, I think there's a tremendous opportunity there to sort of leverage that relationship between us and the agencies in order to, in order to sort of focus our cause more. So absolutely, I think that's part of the plan.

MRS. RUSSELL: Also I think what was really good here and which relates back to that statement about best practice and communicating with the agencies, by communicating with EPA and having their cooperation, they actually let us into areas where they have robot.textiles blocking other crawlers, and they actually helped us get access to some of these databases that are not on the surface of the Web.

So, there's really not only that sort of best practice courtesy of letting them know that we're crawling, but by actually having that affirmative relationship getting access to things that they don't normally allow just anybody to get into, but as a fellow agency they would allow us
22 access to it.

MR. LANDGRAF: Absolutely, and that's
effectively that we followed with the pilots,
you know, we actually, that was our main contact
there, was the, was the Web search manager for the
EPA Website and he basically gave us the parameters
for what we could and couldn't do and you know,
including rates at which we actually hit the site
with the crawlers.

MS. MILLER: The only thing I'm a
little -- well I want to encourage an ongoing
conversation with any and all Web masters and Web
constructors within the Federal Government.

I think one of the things is to, that
also concerns me a little bit is to let the agencies
decide what's in scope and I'm not sure that's
exactly what you meant, but.

MR. LANDGRAF: No.

MS. MILLER: I think because the
agencies don't know what's in scope, frankly, a lot
of them, and some of them do, some of them don't and
so there needs to be that kind of conversation
between the GPO and the agencies to ensure that
you're all on the same page.

MR. LANDGRAF: I would absolutely agree with that. Yeah, there's no doubt that they would need to understand a little bit better what the scope of what we're trying to do is, as well, absolutely.

We, I don't think we could just sort of take their word for it, right.

MR. BYRNE: Tim Byrne. We heard this morning about a new age of cooperation between NTIS and GPO and NTIS right now, most of its content really comes from Web harvesting, so has there been any, you know, discussion with them of the sharing of what they've learned in the process?

MRS. RUSSELL: Yes. And part of that comparison of overlap will, will help us address that. We're very interested in comparing, once we get these results more tamped down, comparing these results with what EPA materials have been harvested by NTIS that will help them evaluate the efficacy of their crawler, too, so that will be, you know, there's an opportunity there, so, further
collaboration and comparison.

MR. SUDDUTH: Kathy said something about in scope and out of scope and of course I'm not interested in whether something shows up on MarthaStewart.com, oh, gee, is that the right address? Anyway.

But I would be interested in, in domains and how that broke down and, you know, other information like that, but you also mentioned State level information and you could, I could say, well, that might be in scope. It would, it might be of interest to me in my, or in my State of what EPA documents are showing up on State.

MS. BRAZEE: Well these aren't EPA published by the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States, these are published by individual States.

MR. SUDDUTH: States.

MS. BRAZEE: So they're not actually U.S. Government publications.

MR. SUDDUTH: But they are State publications.

MRS. RUSSELL: Yes.
MR. SUDDUTH: Right.

MS. BRAZEE: Yes.

MR. SUDDUTH: Right, you know, which there may be people within those States that may have an interest, even if it's just identified, you know.

Yes, Richard.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to pick up on that. I heard Bruce yesterday say what he considered to be critically important that there was an awful lot of information out there at the State and local level that GPO needed to be talking more about, identifying this.

This could be a very interesting added value here coming out of this project, if you're identifying a lot of State documents.

I know in New Mexico through our digital archive project that started out with, with harvesting born digital documents, State documents, that we've begun to add to that fugitive Federal documents as part of that project. So I know we're all discovering that kind of thing, so this could really be a very exciting benefit from this project.
MRS. RUSSELL: That may be exactly the kind of thing that needs that human element looking at it. I mean those may be State documents that were submitted to EPA as a result of a regulatory requirement, then that might make them in scope even though initiated by a State Government.

So, you know, there's so much subtleties to this that it's not a, it's not an easy black and white kind of question, why does EPA have those on their Website and is it because they were a mandatory submission or filing and I don't have any idea because I've never seen any of them.

MR. LANDGRAF: And I think the intention is to really further refine the rules to sort of capture some of those subtleties without sort of opening up to things that may not be in scope, a wide universe of things that might not be in scope.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

Is there somewhere a definition of what the scope is so that could be shared with agencies and people who are users of the site to understand what's in it and what is not in it?

MRS. RUSSELL: The problem I think there,
Pete, is that our definition of the scope uses terms like published Government information in whatever form or format and the reality is that some people consider that posting something on a Website is, by definition is publishing, so maybe they published a cafeteria menu and so it, there's, it's, there are definitions, there is a statement of scope, but that statement of scope is, is modified by practice in terms of what you know. And I think the cafeteria menu is probably an example of that and I'm sure there are probably others, but to some people that could be deemed a publication, you know. In some cases forms are publications.

Certainly the IRS forms we keep track of, but we don't take every form for or historically have not in the print world taken and distributed every form from every agency, so going forward that's the kind of question that needs to be addressed.

Are IRS forms different and are there other kinds of forms that are different that we should be having or should we just be saying just come ahead and take all forms. It's not as though
we're sending them and you have to process them and
put them on a shelf and file them, but on the other
hand, maybe that's a lot of noise in the system.

So there's a lot of that nuance that has
to be discussed and that's why I think it's not very
easy to just simply say there's not a nice, neat,
tight definition. It's a lot tighter in print than
it is in the digital form.

MR. HEMPHILL: Sure. It was a lot
tighter. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder,
right?

MRS. RUSSELL: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. TULIS: This is Susan Tulis,
Southern Illinois University.

Did you get any publications that were
done at regional offices? I mean were you able to
tell that?

MR. LANDGRAF: Yes, we did.

MS. TULIS: Okay.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other comments about
this question?

We just have a few minutes left, there's
one question left and we might have talked about it
or kind of beaten around the edge of it, but do you have any suggestions on which agency Websites would be best to focus in on a future project.

I did hear the suggestion with the NTIS, maybe working with them, Walt suggested, you know, talking and I think you've heard several recommendations that probably need more information just from this project before we, I mean before I would want to touch anything.

Anybody else?

Okay. Any last questions council?

I do have a couple of announcements before we do take a break.

Judy asked that the Indiana delegation join her at the front up here at the beginning of the break for information about tomorrow's lunch and we've had an individual misplace their coat, she didn't know whether it was at lunch or not, but if you have run across or found a coat, please go to the registration desk and let them know that you have located an item that's not yours.

Other than that, we'll be back at 3:30 and we have time for a break.
MR. LANDGRAF: Thank you, everybody.

(Recess taken until 3:30 p.m.).

MR. SUDDUTH: I have the pleasure of introducing Alfonso Aguilar, who is the chief of the office of citizenship at the Department of Homeland Security. The office of citizenship is within U.S. citizenship and immigration services in Homeland Security and it's mandated by the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to promote instruction and training on citizenship rights and responsibilities and to provide immigrants with information and tools necessary to successfully integrate into American civic culture.

Under the auspices of the task force, the office of citizenship plans to offer a citizenship and civics tool kit for immigrants to libraries nationwide, including the Federal Depository Library Program.

So with that, I'll turn over to Alfonso and he'll give you more information.

MR. AGUILAR: Well, good afternoon to everyone. I want to thank Ric Davis and the Government Printing Office as well as the council.
for giving me the opportunity to participate in this conference and I hope you're having a great day today and enjoying the sessions. Hopefully this will be a productive one.

And I think what we have to talk about today, it's an important issue. Immigration, immigrant integration, what the Federal Government is doing to help immigrants become part of our community, become part of American civic culture and what can libraries do to, to play a role in this process of assimilation of integration.

But I think I should begin by putting, explaining the policy context of the debate on immigration and on immigrant integration. And indeed integration is the issue of the day, as you all know, we are living in historic times and I think the numbers are pretty impressive if you look at it. One in every nine U.S. resident is foreign born. From 2002 to 2005, we have received 3.8 million new permanent residents. In that same time frame, we have naturalized 2.1 million new citizens. I think that's, that's very impressive.

I don't know of any other country on the face of the
earth that is as open as we are to immigrants. But
I think it's also interesting that over 80 percent
of those immigrants that are coming legally to the
country are coming from non-European countries,
Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean.

The top five birth countries of new
Americans are Mexico, Philippines, India, Vietnam,
China, indeed, a very diverse community. And
settlement patterns are also changing.

In the '90s still the, we still had the
major immigration hubs being New York, Miami,
Houston, L.A.

Well, immigrants are now going
everywhere. Wherever there is a job, immigrants go.

Settlement patterns are changing, so we're seeing
new gateways, States that where the immigrant --
where immigrant communities are growing incredibly,
States like Georgia, North Carolina, Nevada, they
are being faced with an incredible growth of their
immigrant community. Some States, in fact, that
haven't seen a wave of immigrants in a very long
time, perhaps as far back as the turn of the last
century, States like Iowa, Minnesota, experiencing
great growth in their immigrant communities.

So that is, indeed, a challenge. I mean in terms of numbers, we're still not, not, not -- the great waive of immigrants of the last century was still proportionally still larger, but if these numbers continue, who knows. Perhaps in 10 years we could say that this will be the large immigration wave in our history, but regardless, indeed it's an impressive growth of our immigrant communities and an impressive wave of immigrants that we're facing.

Also, of course, we're dealing with the challenge of undocumented immigrants and there are many numbers out there from 8 million undocumented to 12 million, some even say that we may have as many as 20 million undocumented immigrants.

And certainly 9/11 has created a difficult environment as well. The challenge that we have is after 9/11, how do we continue being a welcoming nation open to immigrants from every corner of the world, but at the same time guarantee the security of the homeland.

That's the, the difficult balancing act that the country has to do. The President was very
clear back in January '04 that our immigration
system is broken and that we need a comprehensive
immigration reform. We need to guarantee the
security of the border. We need to enforce
immigration laws domestically to make sure that
employers don't hire undocumented immigrants, but we
also need a guest worker program to create a legal
mechanism to allow immigrant workers to come in the
country legally and, and fill those jobs that
Americans don't want.

And as I travel all over the country, I
can tell you that all over the country there's an
ingcredible need for immigrant workers. Not only
because they are jobs that Americans don't want, but
also because the, our native born American work
force is shrinking.

And I mentioned Iowa just now and that's
a perfect example where their work force is
shrinking and they are trying very hard to attract
immigrants to grow their work force. But President
Bush has also mentioned an important issue as part
of his, a part -- an important element of his
immigration reform proposal, and that is how do we
assimilate immigrants in our country.

So far the debate has focused for the most part on whether we need some form of amnesty, guest worker program, some form of early (inaudible) whether we should focus on the border first and those are all important issues that I think Congress should tackle and helpfully the next Congress will.

But there's another important issue that hasn't -- that Congress and unfortunately the media hasn't paid too much attention to, and that's the issue of immigrant assimilation.

If we have an open legal immigration policy, if we're, if we have people settling in record numbers in the United States, what are we doing to help them become part of the community, help them become part of American civic culture?

In that respect, I think President Bush has had the vision to be the first President in 100 years since the great wave of immigrants to talk about the issue of assimilation and to mention assimilation, immigrant assimilation or immigrant integration as a component of his immigrant -- immigration reform plan.
Now, assimilation policy is based on the idea that our national identity is not based on race, ethnicity, religion, but in a common language, ending, common civic values and a common history that leads individuals, leads citizens to develop a shared sense of solidarity of community, which is essential for, for a country.

And why is this essential? Well, for one thing, we definitely want to preserve our national identity, and again our national identity is not based on religion or race, but on civic ideals. And why is that important, it's important because in a liberal democracy where you have large ethnic minorities, we -- you want to make sure that, first, of course, you celebrate the diversity that they bring to the nation, the different languages that are spoken at home, the different cultural traditions, religions, but we need a common set of values that can unite the country so we can preserve our political and social cohesion.

And this is fundamental for the nation. So we need to preserve our American national identity to guarantee our political and social
cohesion. And I think we have taken assimilation for granted. I think most people believe assimilation works in America and I have to say that for the most part it is working right now, immigrants are assimilating, but my belief is that if we don't strengthen our assimilation integration efforts and if we continue with this pattern of immigration, then it, you know, likely we will, we may have social issues emerge 20, 30 years down the road.

People forget and people say, well, we had great assimilation efforts 100 years ago. People forget that, yes, we were receiving immigrants in record numbers back in the turn of the last century, but in 1924, Congress passed what was called the National Origins Act which pretty much closed the border to immigrants.

And we had a moratorium really from 1924 to 1965 where we really didn't have immigrants coming in the United States in large numbers and some people argue and I think I would agree with them that we had a 40-year period where we were able to assimilate to integrate ethnic minorities by
preserving an ethnic majority.

But I will submit to you that now we're not going to have a moratorium. Since 1965, since the civil rights movement we had in '65, a comprehensive immigration reform that opened the border to immigrants from all over the world and that, and since 1995, there has been an incredible growth, as I just mentioned, of immigrants coming to the country legally. And that's not going to stop. So we're not going to have a moratorium to integrate or assimilate immigrants, so that's why we need to strengthen this, this effort.

We are going to have a nation and the census already shows it by 2050, a nation of minorities where you're not going to have one majority group. And I think that, that is very interesting that I, as a Hispanic American, feel that that is a great thing for a country, for diversity and breaches the fabric of our country, but at the same time, it is a challenge, it is a challenge of a liberal democracy, again, when you have so many, when your population is composed of different diverse minority groups to keep the unity
and cohesion of the country.

And, you know, some of you may think that, well, you know, perhaps it's not as important. People will eventually assimilate. But if we look at what's happening in Europe right now, it's an issue of concern. I'm sure many of you saw last year in the newspapers in the media the riots in France where immigrants were rioting that they feel that they were not being integrated in the country. Well, those rioting were French nationals, some born abroad, some born in French -- in France, from Middle Eastern origin. They received social benefits, housing, health care, but they didn't feel French and they were, they were not perceived as French in their own country. And that's, indeed, an issue.

Certainly in terms of in the UK, the terrible terrorist acts that happened there, some of the terrorists were, were British born, some, some of them were not even of Middle Eastern origin, but they had radicalized right there in the UK, something happened that they didn't feel part of that community.
And also in the Netherlands, I'm sure perhaps you've heard of the murder of Theo VanGogh, the famous cinematographer who produced a movie about the Muslim culture. Muslims were offended and he was murdered. That created many issues in the Netherlands.

Now, the problem that I think Europe has faced is that they have based their, they have based their, their political projects, their democratic project on a multi-, multi-culturalist vision of integration, meaning that we receive immigrants, but we, but as long as they respect the law and -- that's enough. We, we'll respect --
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MR. AGUILAR: -- different cultures, but we won't talk about a sense of belonging or a sense of patriotism because that's offensive to the respective cultures.

Well, you cannot have, again, political and social cohesion in a country, in a democracy if people don't share values, despite their ethnic, religious, racial backgrounds. It's fundamental for
a democracy when people are so different to have unifying values. If not, people feel marginalized. If not, people don't feel part of the country like it happened in France.

And I think at this point Europeans are saying, well, perhaps that multi-culturalist model has not worked. Perhaps we need to build a political project that is more inclusive, that somebody from Morocco can move to France, settle in France, become a French national, feel French and be perceived as French. That is the challenge that they're facing and for them it's very difficult.

Now obviously in America we have an advantage in the sense that we built our nation on civic ideals and I think that's the advantage that we have, but if, again, if we don't strengthen these efforts, we may have similar issues or challenges like Europe is having right now.

So, what we're trying to do is to revive, in 100 years ago we had an Americanization movement. The great Presidents, rival Presidents of the progressive era, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, were champions of this Americanization
movement and what it meant was that the Federal Government, the Bureau of Naturalization with the Bureau of Education would lead an effort, partnering with community organizations, with churches, with trade organizations, even with libraries to encourage immigrants to learn English, learn our civic values and learn our history, to promote at the national level a deep sense of patriotism, to promote against those common civic values. And it worked.

So as we talk about assimilation, as the President talks about assimilation, that's what we're trying to do, revive that Americanization movement in the context of the 21st Century.

Again, we celebrate the diversity that immigrants bring to the country, but at the same time we want to make sure that they do integrate, that if they're here, they feel that, and become citizens, they feel that they are part of the community, that they are not, you know, Salvadorian in the Washington, D.C., area, but a true American in the community, part of the community of Salvadorian origin.
Again, you can respect the heritage, your heritage, the values of your home country, but still feel fully part of the American experiment.

So, Congress, even before 9/11, realized that we needed to develop an initiative to encourage immigrants to integrate and back in 2002 with the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, in the Homeland Security Act, the Office of Citizenship was created.

And our mandate is to use the immigration process to encourage immigrants as soon as they arrive here to learn English and learn about our civic values. And we have developed a number of products and I think we have copies of some of our products out there, brochures about our publications that have become very popular with immigrant-serving organizations throughout the country and with faith-based organizations as well that work with immigrants.

Now, for the past decades, immigration services had just been focused on processing paperwork, processing applications and getting
benefits to the applicants, but we had forgotten about making sure that people understood the meaning of the benefit they're receiving.

The community that we're targeting are immigrants and by immigrants, we mean in legal terms permanent residents. A permanent resident is a person who comes here with an immigrant visa, receives a green card. It's a person who's chosen to make America their home and live and work here permanently. Somebody with a non-immigrant status, let's say a work visa or a student visa, we say they have non-immigrant status. We expect them to go back to their home country when they end their period here.

So we want to target immigrants as soon as they arrive in the country and we have developed a new immigrant guide. This is a very popular publication and it's a how to settle in the United States guide that provides information to new-comers about life in America, housing, education, health care, but also in a friendly way encourages them to learning English, learn about the country.

The great thing about this is that we
have developed this product in 10 different languages, because we recognized that many new-comers arrive in our country without speaking English. So we want to encourage them in a friendly way to learn English in their own language, tell them to learn English from the very beginning and learn about our nation.

And this is a product that we're distributing to new permanent residents as they arrive. We have also developed a, a, for those who are eligible for citizenship and are applying for naturalization, want to become citizens, we've developed a civics pamphlet based on the current nationalization exam, which is called Learn About America, Quick Civic Lessons, which gives them the questions and answers for the naturalization exam, but provides them with additional information to encourage additional civic learning.

We also developed a set of flash cards based on the current questions from the nationalization exam. And we're working on developing a new naturalization exam. The current naturalization exam is not very substantive, is
unfortunately based on, it was developed 20 years ago based on, really on trivia, not on a basic civics curriculum and we're hoping to have a new test that we're going to start administering by 2008 that's going to be based on a standard civics and history curriculum.

And another initiative that we're developing in partnership with the National Constitution Center, it's a civics orientation training, civic orientation module that, video presentation that will provide directly to immigrants on the civic values that define our national identity and it covers the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and it targets immigrants specifically.

This is just a beginning of, this is just the beginning in terms of the work that we're doing. Recognizing that we need to do more, the President signed back in, and issued back in June an Executive Order creating a task force on new Americans. The idea of the task force, the task force is composed of several Federal agencies and
the idea is to maximize the resources of the Federal
Government to develop educational initiatives to
courage immigrants to learn English and learn
about our country.

We are looking at different initiatives, the task force is, the task force is right now. One
of them is a volunteer initiative to encourage
native born Americans to volunteer, take time to
teach English and civics and citizenship to
immigrants. This is something that is similar and
consistent to what was done 100 years ago during the
Americanization process.

And another initiative that we're
working on and the one I want to specifically talk
about today and get your input, it's a library
initiative. I think libraries are obviously a
fundamental institution in every single city, town
in America. Already there are many libraries
reaching out to these new constituencies that they
find in their communities. I can think of libraries
in, public library of Hartford, Queens, Austin,
reaching out to immigrants and building an immigrant
section in their libraries with good civics content.
Many of them have partnered with us and we have offered them material for their immigrant sections. They're going beyond just providing educational material and publications to new-comers, they also have English language software in those, in many of those libraries where an immigrant can use the computer of the library to start learning English. Some of them are going beyond that, providing services, specific service to immigrants such as English classes and citizenship classes. Well, I think it's, it's time, considering the, the statistics, considering the settlement patterns that we partner with libraries and that's, and that's the idea behind the library initiative.

The library initiative has two main components, what we're calling the dual Americans library initiative. The first component is a citizenship tool kit and we are developing that tool kit as we speak. The tool kit will include many of the products that, that we have developed, some other products that we're in the process of developing and the idea is to mail to every single
participating library one or two sets of tool kits
so they can share with their immigrant constituency.

The other component is what I mentioned
before, this civic orientation module that we're
developing to the national, with the National
Constitution Center so we could use the library as a
venue where we would go to the library, Federal
officials would go to, from immigration services
would be willing to go to the libraries and use them
as a venue to provide these orientation sessions to
immigrants. Again, this would allow libraries to
expand their services to, to immigrants.

We believe that college libraries can
also play an important role. Many college libraries
develop or library services, library studies
programs develop programs for the surrounding
community. This is certainly something that I think
would be of interest for such schools and I think
this is an issue that I think it's of importance to
library study students, because again, those who are

going to be working in libraries throughout the
countries, countries especially in public libraries
will encounter this, this new group of stakeholders,
this new group of customers, immigrants.

So, that is basically the concept that we have for the, for the new library initiative that we wanted to share with you. We have been working -- talking to the Government Printing Office and they shared with us the, the existence of this network of Federal depositories and I think it would be very good to develop a partnership with the Federal, the network of Federal depository libraries to disseminate this material throughout the Federal depositories. But also to use some of these libraries that are Federal depositories as venues to provide these services.

One of the issues that is obviously out there is the issue of funding and obviously every time I speak about this issue, people get very excited, you know, the Federal Government is paying attention to new-comers, to immigrants and, you know, I finish my presentation and they say, well, where's the money. And we realize that.

So another thing that we're going to do as part, as we develop these efforts is we're going to hold round table discussions with different
sectors of society and do research and see how we can raise funding for these type of initiatives. It may require additional legislation, that's something that we're studying where the Federal Government could commit resources for grants to libraries that have these type of programs. But also reach out to the private sector to make sure that we can leverage resources from the private sector because after all, the private sector companies are benefiting incredibly from the immigrant workforce, will be I think a great thing to have big corporations provide funding for this type of effort so we could provide grants to libraries to develop these type of efforts.

So, in general, that's what I wanted to share with you. I think this is a very exciting initiative. I think this is going to get even more attention as we begin, you know, after the election as we begin discussing the legislative agenda for the next year and again, this will be a major component of the President's comprehensive immigration reform proposal.

And I truly believe that the libraries
can play a major role. The fact of the matter is they, that many are already reaching out to, to new-comers and I think we, we have to, and many are going to start in the next few years realizing that they have an immigrant community that is growing that they need to serve and I think this is a great initiative that would allow us to provide material, materials, resources to expand services, but also build capabilities that perhaps libraries don't have right now to deal more adequately and effectively with, with those communities, and perhaps eventually even providing funding for libraries that provide these type of services.

So again, I thank you so much for the opportunity and hopefully we can have a lively discussion about how we can develop a national campaign to encourage immigrants to assimilate and how libraries can play a major role in that effort.

Thank you, very much.

(Applause)

MR. SUDDUTH: Any questions or comments from council?

MR. SANDLER: Yeah, I guess I'll jump
I'm wondering whether or not you've done I
guess since you used the word products, I'll use the
word market surveys, have you talked to these
customers about their, their sense of how they get
information, you know, and from their perspective,
are libraries actually an important delivery
mechanism for, for their, for their adjustment to a
new culture or a new society?

MR. AGUILAR: Right, well let me, that's
a very good question and let me say as I have begun
this work, as the Office of Citizenship was created
three years ago and I'm the first chief of the
office, it's amazing at how little research there is
on this specific issue of immigrant integration.

We can look at statistics of immigrants
entering the country or settlement patterns, but in
terms of immigrants using libraries, for example,
there's very little information. We did conduct a
focus group some time ago and I think ALA, if I'm
not -- IMLS assisted us, the Institute for Museum
and Library Studies helped us organize this focus
group about two years ago and we brought together in
Chicago a group of representatives from libraries
that have immigrant integration programs, if you want to call it that, and so we got all our information from them and in fact that report was issued about a year ago and it's available on our Website, USCIS.gov. You click on the link to the Offices of Citizenship, you'll find that Website, however the Website is mostly anecdotal in terms of what works and what we've heard from libraries, from immigrants serving libraries and other immigrant-serving organizations like community centers and churches, as well, is that there, there's lack of access to information.

So, in those, those libraries that have reached out to immigrants, definitely get immigrants to visit their library, their libraries and use the material. Obviously there are some issues in terms of funding because some libraries just don't have the resources to handle an entirely new community and so there are challenges out there.

For example, in some of our district offices, we have a new online system so you can get your appointments with immigration services online and I think it was in Minnesota where we referred
people to the library, go to your public library, use the computer and get your appointment online.

Our district office got a call, I think it was in St. Paul, from the library saying don't refer those people here. We don't have enough computers, because all of a sudden they found, you know, literally dozens of immigrants lining up to use the computer.

So, I think as we look at this we have to be careful in terms of what is the service and the material we're sharing with them at the library. I think those libraries that are really open to receiving immigrants to provide all kinds of services should, should openly tell immigrants that they can, they can receive them and they can use the computers for those type of services.

Those libraries that can't receive immigrants so they can use their computers to, you know, get appointments online, they should also tell specifically the immigrant when they market their program, what is the service that they can provide in the library.

I think most libraries could probably
receive the immigrant and provide -- well, the tool kits is something that is just a matter of allowing the immigrant to go into the library and have access to the tool kit.

In terms of providing orientation sessions on the naturalization process and on civics, I think that many libraries would be open to that. It's just, you know, it's something that you can do once a month or every other month, but each library is different.

But honestly, information that we have is mostly anecdotal. My theory is that we need to develop an initiative and as we develop the initiative, then at the same time we have to start immediately doing some research and getting librarians together and saying, well, how is this experiment going, because unfortunately we don't have that much data.

But in the meantime, the truth is that we're receiving immigrants in our community, so we should do something. Clearly from our interaction with libraries, the anecdotal evidence that we have is that immigrants, if libraries target immigrants,
immigrants will go to libraries and libraries can truly make a big difference with immigrants because they don't feel threatened. You know, sometimes, adult education programs in community colleges, in school districts have English as a second language as civics classes, but sometimes immigrants don't feel comfortable going to a community college, but they feel more comfortable going to their local library.

So, again, I think the research is, we don't have good data out there, but I think we can develop something and as we develop it, then we have to start doing research and start getting some numbers of, you know, how many people are going to libraries, are libraries, how many libraries are willing to participate in this initiative, because that's the other thing, we don't want to tell libraries, you know, here you go, here's the material, now we're going to refer people to the public library.

We want to make sure that libraries participate voluntarily. So we want to make sure that our libraries believe that they need to reach
out to immigrants. So, so again, in terms of the material, the feedback that we've received from, on all of our materials from libraries that served immigrants, from immigrant service organizations, from faith-based organizations is extremely -- adult education programs is extremely positive.

Many of our products are for sale through GPO. Many immigrant serving organizations buy in, in large numbers our new immigrant guide in different languages or in English or Spanish or our flash cards and it's GPO who sells them. And it's, I understand it's one of the most popular products. You know, we're normally almost always out of stock because they keep ordering these products and as I travel around the country, I visit citizenship classes, I visit libraries, it's incredible to find all these products all throughout.

So, so again, I think we, we need to begin this initiative because immigrants are settling in our communities, but as we begin, we have to, we have to continue evaluating the initiative to make sure that we are approaching immigrants adequately.
MS. DAVIS: Hi, is this on? My name is Denise Davis and I direct the Office for Research with the American Library Association and I've never heard from you or your office and I will give you my business card because you need to call me.

There are a number of initiatives going on in my association, and not the Institute of Museum and Library Services, which is a Federal funding agency, block grants to State libraries and you need to understand the economic disconnect there.

Every State manages those funds very differently, so in some cases those funds actually make their way to specific projects in States and in other cases those funds actually operate State-wide programs, so you need to become more informed about that. And there's actually a State librarian at the other end who I'm sure has some things to say.

One thing I, there's a great deal of research that's been done and actually a number of those studies have actually been done by my association. We know exactly what the linguistics isolation is of the U.S-based on the 2000 census.
We are analyzing that. We know the racial diversity of the American public and our public libraries know that.

I think one point that you did make which is absolutely critical is the ability in the local community, and we have 16,000 plus outlets in our public library system alone, of those local communities that are funded almost entirely from local funding, local tax dollars, not Federal money, to be able to take on an unfunded mandate of this order.

Having said that, our public libraries do understand the population that they serve and they are doing the best they can with the resources they have. And many of our public libraries do have multi-lingual collections both in print and in audio formats, so they are serving these populations to the extent that they can.

What would be useful from our office would be the kinds of cultural information that library staff need in order to bridge the cultural gap between the populations they're trying to bring in to the library, which is far into them, having
worked in public libraries, I can tell you the concept of borrowing books for free and returning them is an unusual concept for many immigrants to absorb. It's not something that they're familiar with and they don't understand that. And they often learn from their children.

So, as you think about how you want to roll this out in a more deliberate way, there needs to be more than a pamphlet or a small tool kit to really bring those two communities together. There needs to be a really strategic and well thought-out initiative that does do at a very grass roots level the kinds of education that's required on both ends to make a program like this successful and it takes a lot of money.

MR. AGUILAR: Well, I appreciate the question. You've made several points. Well first, let me address the last point you made, obviously this is a comprehensive approach. The library initiative is just a component of a larger effort.

As I mentioned, we're working on developing also a volunteer initiative to encourage people within the community, native-born Americans
to take time to volunteer, to teach English and teach civics. There's an incredible demand for and we know that for English classes, for citizenship classes, adult education programs sometimes have or many times have huge waiting lists for their programs.

Also, immigrants sometimes rather --

sometimes they don't have the time to go to an adult education program because they have one -- two jobs, and they're working, exactly, so we have to be creative and in terms of how we provide those services.

For example, the churches, for many within the Hispanic community, their parish, their church is the point of entry to the community. And many churches are already developing citizenship and English language programs. But they lack training, so what we're looking at is not only encouraging people to volunteer, but also provide training to volunteers. And we're working with the Department of Education to provide training to volunteers. So, so they can appropriately teach English and civics to, to, to new-comers.
Now, in terms of funding, I would say, yes, I mean that's why we have to look at the issue of funding, but at the same time I think I would say it's something that we have to look at, that's why I said that it may be that we may need additional legislation to create a new pot of money, perhaps separate from the traditional structures that have been created and that's really what initially we have been looking at. So this would be separate from, from other funding streams. But also reach out to the private sector, so the private sector can, can provide resources for this type of initiative.

So, I mean I want to make the point obviously that we're not depending exclusively on the library where we'd say the library is the place to go, it's just another resource that they would have and at least in the library they have on their own, in their own time they could have access to this material.

Now, in terms of ALA, I must say that, you know, when we began considering this idea and it was a long time ago when we started to talk about
it, one of the first places that we talked to was the American Library Association and perhaps we can talk off line about that. And I think initially people, some of the librarians were concerned because our office is under the Department of Homeland Security, so they immediately thought that we were thinking of going to the libraries to get information, whatever, and far from it.

You know, you know, our office has a very specific mandate within immigration services and we don't do enforcement or anything like that. This is totally far from it. But I guess they saw the Homeland Security seal and they immediately got scared. So obviously we are, we are not only, you know, we're working with the IMLS, but we want to reach out to the American Library Association and other library organizations that can provide very valuable input as we develop this initiative.

(End Track 10 on CD.)

(Beginning Track 11 on CD.)

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other questions or comments from council?

MS. GARCIA: Name is Mary Garcia, I'm
from the Miami Dade Public Library.

We receive a large number of immigrants on a regular basis. Most of them have a lot of trouble using the computers. They are not computer literate. When they come into our facility, they want us to fill out the forms for them, they want us to do the applications so they can make their appointment. A lot of times we don't have the staff to do that, they don't understand why they are being sent to the library, why they can't receive assistance at the immigration office.

This past month the visa lottery started, the application is not in Spanish, it's in English, and as a result, they often ask us, you know, what's the best answer to the question which we cannot advise them.

The other problem is that with these online forms, like for instance the visa lottery has, they have to upload their pictures, which is another technical aspect that they need assistance with.

Sometimes they bring their pictures already on a CD Rom, sometimes they don't, and
again, it's something in addition to just telling them here's a computer, you have to have someone to technically go through it with them.

I understand that libraries play an important role, but there has to be a computer component, there's something, there's a gap between what the patrons know and what we can do for them.

MR. AGUILAR: Right. And I appreciate that and this is what I would say, because, you know, when I, when I talk about this initiative, I'm specifically talking about immigrant integration in terms of providing material on our civic values or history, perhaps English language software at the libraries, not in general information on immigration. That's really not what I do.

That's something that if it's a real concern to you, you have to reach out to our district office in Miami. Each district office has a different policy. We don't have a national level policy where we say go to your public library. That varies from district to district.

It may be that the leadership in our district office in Miami is, in fact, recommending
21 people to go to the Miami Dade library and schedule
22 their appointments. If that's the case then and you
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1 think it's a real concern, then definitely talk to
2 them to make sure that they stop that practice,
3 because obviously, you know, that's unfair to you.
4
5 But at the national level we don't have
6 a policy where we tell immigrants go to your public
7 library to have your immigration forms filled out
8 because, I mean, that's, it's, it's -- not anyone
9 can help you fill out a form, first of all, you need
10 some sort of training.
11
10 MS. GARCIA: And a lot of times they'll
11 come with a sheet of paper that has the Web address
12 that was given to them by the immigration department
13 and they don't even know what a Web address is or
14 how to even input them into the computer.
15
15 MR. AGUILAR: Right. Right. And that's
16 the other point that you make which is very
17 important and it's the digital divide and that
18 exists out there and this is something that we are
19 seriously considering, you know.
20
20 We are also a benefits agency and to be
21 more efficient, we are moving towards concepts of
E-Government, E-filing, but we have to take into account that there's a considerable number of immigrants that don't have access to computers or are just totally computer illiterate and that's something that we have to keep in mind.

Now in terms of what we do, we are also aware of that, that's why we're working very hard to make sure that our material is not only available online, but that we can distribute and disseminate our material, hard copies of our material for free in different languages to immigrants.

And, so, absolutely. I don't, I think that's something that we need to consider. I don't know if it's something that as an agency immigration services can address, but it's something that as we, as we go out to different communities and conduct this research about services available, certainly we have to take into account that digital divide and, but, you know, that's where I've seen immigrant organizations that help, you know, throughout the country help immigrants, receive immigrants and help them develop basic computer skills or help them fill out the form online.
I think the importance with immigrants is also, you know, providing them good information. Where they can go, where they can really help them. We don't want to refer them to a place where they're going to go and they're not going to be able to receive a specific service, but there are many organizations out there, community and churches providing that type of service that if a person doesn't have access to a computer, they can use a computer or if they are not computer literate, they can get training or they can have somebody work with them to fill out the form.

But, you know, in terms of the other forms, we're also looking at not mandating E-filing, so you could still file just filling out a hard copy of the form, so that's something that we're looking at, yeah.

MR. HEMPHILL: Alfonso, this is Pete Hemphill. I'm not a librarian and I don't even pretend to be one. I'm a technologist and a public citizen and I guess that's where my comments come from.
It seems to me that there is a large gap and what I've heard from a lot of librarians with regard to the immigrant issue is they feel like they're taking the overflow from the ICE office and, you know, the ICE office can't deal with it so they send them to the public library.

With regard to resources, there seems to be a gap of education and ability to serve those immigrants and deal with the immigration issue. Wouldn't it be in the best interests of both the libraries and the Department of Immigration to be able to develop a policy that works for libraries and a program that works for libraries? I don't think just handing them an English only pamphlet is going to help.

MR. AGUILAR: Oh, wait a second, it's not -- I want to make sure because you're using a terminology that it, it's not English only. It's not an English only policy, because we are approaching them in their own language. We are approaching somebody in Spanish in a friendly way and saying, because, you know, immigrants want to learn English.
MR. HEMPHILL: But you have to understand that librarian may not be multi-lingual and to try to help somebody out, else out would be a difficult situation. There needs to be training there. There needs to be people capable of handling that situation.

So, you know, it's going to take some work. I certainly think the libraries are a great place for people to come and a place to exchange information, maybe the ICE people could come to the libraries and hold seminars to help take care of the overflow. That's just my input.

MR. AGUILAR: No, I think that's very valuable and, in fact, we are already working with some libraries throughout the country that are proactively targeting immigrants and going out there and, you know, again I mentioned the Hartford Library and we have an incredible working relationship with them and we go out there and provide orientation sessions.

I mean that's one of the components of this initiative is to go out to libraries and provide perhaps an orientation session on the
naturalization process, but also take advantage of that to provide an orientation session on, on our civic values, you know, targeting immigrants and using the library.

I mean I don't, at the same time I mean to be fair to immigration services, you know, I am sure that there are places where we're not referring immigrants to public libraries and they're still going there. I mean that's a reality of, of the times. I mean the immigrant, immigrants are coming in record numbers. They are settling throughout the country and, you know, they're part of your community.

And regardless -- I mean I would think that perhaps in most district offices we don't refer immigrants to libraries, but I'm sure you're still going to have immigrants, many immigrants going to libraries for services.

I mean the public library is, it's an institution of the community, so it makes perfect sense for them to go there, so. I mean I wouldn't, you know, I don't think it's, I mean again, to be fair to immigration services, it's not, you know,
the fault of immigration services, it may be the case in Miami or St. Paul, but I think what we have to do is work, develop a partnership where we can address the needs of this new community, realizing and being very frank that we're going to have, you know, funding issues.

I mean it's not only in terms of libraries, I mean, and this is a very complex complex issue, an issue of immigration, you know, from health care to education. I mean -- which is something that I cannot address all those issues, but certainly States are saying look, you know, immigrants are coming here in record numbers and we don't have enough resources.

You know, it's a very complex issue, but the reality of it is it's not going to change. It's not going to change and so I think that we have to be realistic and work smart and work together in partnership to try to address those, those needs.

Is it going to be a perfect alternative, are we going to have adequate levels of funding; probably not. But I think if we begin addressing this, if we begin working with libraries that are
already receiving immigrants, I think you're going to get the attention of many throughout the country and many policy-makers and many in Congress that will say we need to have more funding for libraries, because they are receiving immigrants.

And think about it, in this entire debate on immigration in Congress, I don't know of any member of Congress, really, that has spoken about libraries and the impact that immigrant, immigrants are having on libraries.

I know of members of Congress talking about the impact it's having on their health care system, on education, but really not on libraries. I mean the truth is this is impacting every single sector of our society.

So, I think I hear you and I think it's very important that we work in partnership to try to address this need. And I think if we, if we start building something, we may be able eventually to get the attention of policy-makers and get certainly more funding for these type of efforts.

MR. HEMPHILL: Just perhaps a suggestion, perhaps if you write to the directors of
the public libraries and other libraries and request
their input as to what they need in order to handle
their immigrant population, they may get an earful,
but at least you'll have support, funding to be able
to do what's necessary.

MR. AGUILAR: No, look, again, I hear
you 100 percent and I think that's something that we
need to do. That's why as I talk about this
initiative, I want to make sure that we don't make
it another unfunded mandate.

This is more of a partnership where if
you are a library that you want to proactively
engage immigrants and you have, and you think you
can do it and you think you can benefit from this,
then come on, come on and we'll work with you.

But if it's a library that doesn't have
the resources, I don't think they should do it. I
think they should wait until or provide that input
that we can take into consideration and eventually
when we have more funding or other sources of
funding, then perhaps they could actually engage.

That's why I want to start developing
something little by little with those libraries that
can to show policy-makers that it is important to support the work the libraries are doing. But certainly as we develop this initiative, we'll be talking to, to librarians and to other groups and let me tell you, I mean everywhere we go we do hear, you know, a lot, a lot of concern and we take it into account.

MS. QUINN: Amy Quinn, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Just a couple of things. One is that I really applaud that ICE is doing this and something I've been long advocating. The University of Illinois has a contract with the Department of State to answer questions and about a third of those questions come from people who want to immigrate or librarians who are trying to help people fill out forms from immigration. There is a very big disconnect between the information that's being asked for and the understanding of the immigrants themselves.

I also happen to get a lot of questions from staffers on the Hill and from other places on trying to understand.
Now just to give you an idea,

Senator Durbin and Senator Obama are very aware of the impact of immigration on libraries only because I've talked to them at great length about how much it impacts us.

In Chicago, the immigration office does not refer anybody to the public library or to the UIC. They find UIC, for example, simply because we are the official component of the Department of State and so when you want to get a visa, any kind of visa information, they come to us, which is kind of weird as opposed to the public library.

However, I think one of the things that's missing from the entire initiative that I've seen is a national strategy for guidelines in how to work with it. I work very closely with the churches and with various immigration offices.

We have a lot of Universities in Chicago and a lot of pro bono work that's done for immigrants, especially between the University of Chicago and Depaul, and I work with all of them. I think that having guidelines on how to work together.
One of the things I asked for early on was could we not just at least have a meeting once a year just to go over changes in immigration law just so we understood, especially with retrogression schedules and things of that nature.

MR. AGUILAR: Thank you so much and, look, Illinois has one of the most proactive immigrant coalitions in the country and I've, they, in fact, and I really respect what Senator Durbin has done, Congressman Guitierrez, Governor Bogavich.

The Governor developed a new Americans initiative in Illinois, the only State-funded Illinois -- immigrant initiative to help immigrants learn English, learn civic values and go through the naturalization process. I think the State funding was minimal, a few million dollars, but, you know, there you saw a community coming together where you have Congressman Guitierrez providing services even through his offices, a wide variety of organizations coming together under this coalition to help immigrants integrate and I think that's the right approach of different organizations, different organizations coming together to address the need of
new-comers and to maximize resources.

And they didn't wait for the Federal Government, you know, they took leadership. Now in Illinois we do have, however, a very good working relationship with that coalition and I think it would be very useful for you to get in touch with them. And we can certainly perhaps, you know, after give you some points of contact there, because we periodically meet with immigrant advocates and other groups in Chicago and other areas of Illinois to provide basic information, which goes to show that there's an incredible demand for information and you're never going to satisfy that demand, but you need to think smart and see how you can reach out to different groups to get the word out.

So, but you're, you know, I think it's appropriate to definitely, and in many communities we do have libraries going to our, our immigration meetings. I hate to mention the Hartford library again, but the truth is that they are doing an incredible job.

Now I've been to Hartford and met with the Mayor and the Mayor is committed to the library
and, you know, they follow very closely all the immigration issues, so it's a matter of really maximizing resources, at this point.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other questions?

MS. SOLOMON: Judy Solomon from Seattle public library. I just wanted to suggest you might consider something like pod casting, maybe because I'm from Seattle and we're right near Microsoft and we get a lot of computers from them, that might be one way to spread out the information.

Like you said, many immigrants new coming to the United States work two or three jobs, so it's very difficult for them to get into classes but, you know, like their children, you know, they can get on and look at U tube, so that would be one possibility. Also, if you were to do that and set it up as a .gov, then I could certainly work with people on making sure that they get access to computers at the library, just as a thought.

MR. AGUILAR: Well, I'm glad you raised that point because that's another thing that we're looking at. It's developing a Government-wide Website specifically targeting new-comers with
multi-lingual capabilities, a welcome to the USA.gov where an immigrant -- an advertisement where an immigrant could go and get information about different aspects of life in America, education, housing, whatever.

You know, in terms of the training that we're developing with the Department of Education right now, it's really online training. The idea of doing Web casting, I think it's something that's very interesting, that I think we have to look at as well. I think we have to be creative and to me what's clear is that the current system of just counting on the adult education programs for immigrants to go there and learn English and civics, you know, it doesn't work really.

I mean they have some great programs, you go to California, they have some great adult education programs, ESL programs, but it's only a fraction of the immigrant community that goes there to receive services and sometimes they go and they have waiting lists, but as you said, many just don't have the time, so we have to think creatively and certainly technology is something that we have to
At the same time we recognize that there's a digital divide. Something that the Federal Government can do, and this is something that we could look into is, for example, in Boston, the Office of New Bostonians, and Boston is doing an incredible job in reaching out to immigrants, they created this office as new Bostonians and they have in their, they have I guess new Bostonians centers throughout the city and they've partnered with the L.A. unified school district, the school district there developed an English for all software to help high beginning students learn English and apparently they have a contract with the L.A. school district and people on Boston can go online to use this language software.

I think that's a great alternative. Many will benefit from it. Some will not have access to it. But then for those others we have to think to look for another alternative, but I think using the Web is very important and we -- and I think Web casting of some sort I think would be very valuable as well, yes.
I'm Kay Cassell and I'm now teaching at the Library School of Records, but until recently I was at the New York Public Library where one of my responsibilities was, in fact, immigrant services is one of the areas that I supervised.

And I do think it's wonderful that the Federal Government has discovered public libraries and wants us to do things and this is, of course, we could start with the income tax as the first time we were discovered and of course the lottery, too. And I think public libraries want to do their very best, but it's very hard. We have so many different constituents that we're serving that I think that, you know, we really need help to do this well.

Just before I left New York Public Library, we had to cut back some of our English classes for our immigrants because we just couldn't find any money for them. I mean that's ridiculous and, you know, the number of classes we had wasn't even beginning to touch the number of people who really needed services.

I think that, you know, you might want
to really start with working with ALA and trying to help librarians see better the, you know, what's available and what they can take advantage of and maybe that's a way to unroll it, rather than just say giving things to the libraries now.

I think they need more of an overview, I think some of the things that other people have said about understanding better the naturalization process and understanding some of the things going on in the Federal Government that they can, you know, work with.

So, maybe starting with the librarians and, you know, and giving them more orientation might be a good place in addition to the money, of course.

MR. AGUILAR: Look, I think from what I'm hearing today, I think the members of the task force will be conducting throughout the country visits, site visits and round table discussions and I think certainly we should plan several with librarians so you can, so they can hear directly from you your ideas.

And so I certainly want to, you know,
again, I don't want to give the impression that we want to impose a new unfunded mandate because that's not what we really want to do. We want to support the work that some of you are already doing anyway and are going to continue doing and some will start doing soon and would appreciate those resources.

The idea here is not to tell a library that can't handle it take this and develop your citizenship program, as I said, but I truly believe that having many years of experience in this town that you need to start building on something to get the attention of policy-makers and I think that this is a great opportunity to get policy-makers focused on libraries and seeing how libraries can play a role. Yes.

MR. SUDDUTH: Denise.

MS. DAVIS: The task force members, is that list available on your Website?

MR. AGUILAR: I don't think it is, no.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The Executive Order is on the Website.

MR. AGUILAR: The Executive Order is on the Website and there are about 10 cabinet level
agencies and most of the secretaries have delegated
to someone at the assistant secretary level.

For example, we have the Assistant
Secretary of Education for Adult Education. We have
included the IMLS in the technical committee, the
Institute for Museum and Library Services, we have

Justice, Defense, Education, of course, HHS, HUD,
Labor, but the Executive Order is on the Website.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you.

MR. SUDDUTH: Yes.

MS. BARBER: Maranka Barber, Hollins
University, and I should preface this by saying that
I'm in southwest Virginia where public libraries are
perhaps not yet overrun with having to help people
fill out applications. So there's that caveat.

MR. AGUILAR: Get ready.

MS. BARBER: What we could use, just a
practical added bullet point to your approach for
the library initiative is not only educational
materials, but advice and perhaps also materials on
how to reach the community that we're trying to
educate.

So we have a slightly different problem.
We need information on ways to get the word out, venues in which to do that and form, the best formats in which to do that for the different communities. So if you're going to provide educational materials, we could also use help with that thing that librarians are parentally bad at doing, which is marketing our services.

MR. AGUILAR: Okay, that's, you know, something that we can definitely do, I mean as we talk about these orientation sessions and we also have a very nice presentation, flash presentation that we've developed on the naturalization process is we can, we could certainly develop a train the trainer program where we could go to a library and provide that training to you so you can provide some general training.

Now general, my experience with immigrants is you can provide some general information, but many are going to come with very specific questions that you won't be able to answer and you know what, you shouldn't answer either because they are legally complex questions. But you should be able to provide some general information.
and we could definitely provide that training.

That's -- and I think that's, I've heard it from some, some others and I think that's something that as we develop this orientation session, that we've also actually talked about, you know, rather than just going there and providing the orientation session directly to immigrants, we could also at the same time provide some sort of train the trainer program.

Thank you.

MS. SEARS: This is Ann Sears with the Tulsa City County Library in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Our immigrant population is predominantly Hispanic and there is a huge mistrust of Government, so when Judy was saying oh, if you have a .gov site, if you have a .gov site they won't go to it, they're afraid you're tracking them and that you're going to then send them back across the border.

When we do immigration marketing of any kind, any kind of classes or anything, we make sure that they know that they're safe there and we get it out through the rumor mill because you can't get it
through the flyers, you have to send it out through their underground rumors, but we have had plenty of presentations where, you know, we thought we were going to have a large turn-out and then the rumor mill is that the immigration service is going to be there and as a documents librarian, I understand that your office is separate and that you're an educational office, but I can tell you those immigrants don't.

So whenever you're doing this task force and talking about the marketing, I think that's something you really need to be concerned about and make an issue that it not be labeled immigration in any way.

MR. AGUILAR: Well, two things, because, I mean, we do have a lot of experience in -- I mean we do have a network at immigration services of community officers, so throughout the country and we really, I think, do a good job of reaching out to the community.

You have to understand, and I should have mentioned this in my presentation, that INS was disbanded, the old INS. We separated the law
enforcement functions from the immigration services
functions.

(End Track 11 on CD.)

(Beginning Track 12 on CD.)

MR. AGUILAR: ICE is Immigrations and Customs Enforcement. They are the ones that detain undocumented immigrants and will deport them.

We are immigration services, we are the one that deal with legal immigrants, with documented immigrants. We process their applications for status adjustments or application for naturalizations. I always like to say that we're the good side of immigration, so -- but, you know, immigrants have a hard time obviously making that, you know, separating the two, but, you know, we have been very successful in developing good working relationships with a community by clarifying that we're not enforcement.

Now, what I would say is this initiative, however, as I said at the beginning, we're really targeting those who are in the country with legal status, those who are immigrants, meaning permanent residents. Those are not going to have a
problem going to .gov Website or going to a Government agency because they're here legally.

Now the issue of the undocumented, obviously it's an incredible issue, it's very difficult. Congress needs to deal with it.

But right now, until, until we have a comprehensive immigration reform that deals appropriately with that issue, as Government we can, there's nothing we can do with undocumented immigrants. I'm, obviously I participate in immigration forums and I talk to immigrants, I never ask whether they're legal or not, but, but the Government cannot engage directly with undocumented immigrants and provide them information.

So, this type of initiatives, but I'm mindful that many of the customers that go to your libraries are undocumented; however, we shouldn't say or generalize and say that the majority are undocumented, because they're not, I mean the numbers --

MS. SEARS: But we're not going to ask.

MR. AGUILAR: No, exactly.

MS. SEARS: And if we are in an
initiative with you, in a partnership with you,
we're not going to say, oh, well we're only going to
serve you if you're a legal immigrant because that's
not what we're going to do.

MR. AGUILAR: Right, but you're
absolutely right, I mean that's why I said, even a
community college, many would feel uncomfortable
going there, but many feel comfortable going to
their church or perhaps going to their library,
certainly. As long as we can provide you the
material and I think as I'm hearing from you perhaps
also the training to provide some general
orientation.

But, however, I must emphasize
immigration law is so complex that you never, never,
ever be able, because they're going to go there
with their personal cases.

I avoid answering specific questions
because some of the cases are legally complex, so
you should at least be able to provide some general
information.

And, but thank you.
MS. HATHLEY: Kathy Hathley from Poplar Creek library in Streamwood, Illinois.

The Internal Revenue Service offers a well, rather well-developed training session that is administered at our library and many libraries that do train people to the VETA company, that training people to help low income people with their tax forms, librarians in our, my library and community participants take that training class.

When you speak of training from the immigration services, are you speaking of something along those lines in the way of perhaps training people to, librarians or community people to give a naturalization class?

MR. AGUILAR: Okay, we actually have looked at the IRS program, but believe it or not, you know, as a lawyer I can tell you that immigration law is even more complex than tax law, believe it or not, and we can provide some training.

So you can provide general orientation, but again, some of these cases are so legally complex that through training I would only recommend trained lawyers to handle certain, certain cases and
that's where we can, we can as part of the training perhaps provide information to you on where immigrants can go in their community for free legal services.

We have accredited agencies, accredited by the Bureau of Immigration Appeals, organizations throughout the country that are accredited by us to provide legal services for free, the Catholic Legal Network and others.

What I would say, my recommendation to libraries would be, you know, provide the general orientation, but if you see that a person has a very complex question, then try to find out what organizations in your community are accredited to provide legal services for free and you have to make sure that they are accredited, because another thing that happens is that you have a lot of fraud out there and sometimes it's within our own communities, Hispanic communities, you know, notario fraud is very popular where you have Hispanic lawyers, or so-called notarios saying come on to my office and

I'll give you advice, they give them wrong advice, they overcharge them and they take advantage of
them.

So you want to make sure that if you refer them someplace, it's a place that is accredited.

So, I think we have looked at the IRS model, but I don't, I wouldn't, I don't think it would be a good idea to certify anyone as -- but I think we can, however, provide some general orientation so you can in general handle some very basic questions.

MS. SEARS: What about individuals being trained to hold a naturalization class to help people take the test?

MR. AGUILAR: That, that we can do, certainly can, absolutely.

That's, that's something that we're looking at and that's part of the training, but -- and that's something that we're working with with the Department of Education, but right now it's mostly online training and while I believe online training goes far, we still have to find ways of also providing face-to-face training and as part of this volunteer initiative, say your library wants to
develop a citizenship program.

We will have online tools as part of this initiative to allow you with advice on how to build your citizenship program and also online training for the volunteers or others that will participate in the program.

That we will have and I apologize for not discussing it in the context of the library initiative, but it's certainly something that a library can benefit from, but, but this is just the first phase I would say of the, of the training.

I think we have to look at developing perhaps regional training sites that if you're in Illinois and you have seven volunteers, we could say you can go to Chicago to the Literacy Council of Chicago that's certified by us that can provide training on how to give a citizenship class and you can be trained there, so you would have the online training, but also face-to-face time.

That's something that we're looking at, absolutely.

MR. SUDDUTH: Well, thank you very much. We're pretty much out of time.
I do need to remind people that there is at 6:30 p.m. tonight in this room a GODORT SLA joint program and the speakers will be Patrice McDermott and Dr. Lewis Fisher.

So, thank you for coming. Thank you for your information and see you all tomorrow.

(October 23, 2006, meeting adjourned.)
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PROCEEDINGS
MR. SUDDUTH: Welcome to our session.

This will be, what we're going to do is the council has completed its work on their vision statement and I want to give just people a couple more minutes to sit down and I'll get into formal remarks. Nobody has given me any announcements for this morning.

Again, be sure to -- yeah, oh, somebody did slip one up here, okay. All right. Let's see, the latest poll in -- no, no.

You know, I'm glad where I live because I have seen 3,201,000 political ads since I've been here and it bounces back and forth between Virginia and Maryland, but the most interesting thing that happened to me and only some of you will know this is that I opened the paper Friday morning, I was up here for an ALA thing and noticed that the republican Mayoral candidates for the District of Columbia's last name is Cranick. And some of you know Nancy Cranick and I showed it to her and the last I saw she was still rattling around in her head whether this was a relative of hers or not, so those of you who know Nancy can get a good laugh out of that, so. I mean it was spooky things like this.
person grew up in Philadelphia, went to Penn State, so.

Anyway, all right, announcements, the Virginia librarians will meet for lunch at the Holiday Inn restaurant across the street at about 12:10 p.m. Okay.

Again, I mentioned this yesterday, sessions, sometimes there isn't enough time for questions from the audience. There are cards, they are out, we're keeping them out on the reception desk so if you want to grab a couple of those, also, you know, if you don't like to get up to the microphone and you still want to ask a question, you know, grab a couple of cards, they are out there any time and we can go from there.

Okay. Any other announcements that people want to run up here real quick? Okay.

MRS. RUSSELL: Can I make one real quick. I don't see anybody in the room offhand from Indiana, but if you're from Indiana and you're part of a luncheon group, check in at the registration desk not later than the mid-morning break. Thank you.
MR. SUDDUTH: If not, we'll, okay.

Let's go ahead and start.

Again, council has been working on the vision statement for 18 months. We did finally finish it up towards the middle of September. If you do look at the front of it, I on purposely dated it September 29th because there was a lot of members of the class of 2006 who put a lot of energy, hard work into this and so I on purposely dated it on the cusp to make sure that people understood that there are four classes of council who put a lot of work into this.

One thing that you don't see on the cover is because the final product is council's product, but if you go back to the draft publication, there's names of over 20 people who gave council a lot of advice, hard work, time, and so you need to, the draft will still always exist because it was presented and that I want to thank those people again for all the hard work.

Another person that needs to be thanked again, too, is our previous chair, Barbie Selby, for getting us going on the process, pushing it through,
riding our coat tails and putting up with those of us when, and I, we won't mention our names, those of us who went way out on one end and had to get reeled back in. So.

(Applause)

So, thank you again, Barbie.

The plan I have this morning is that I'm going to run through just the 11 issues and then go through each of the seven goals. And as I go through each goal, I want to give members of council an opportunity to make any comments that they have on each of the goals or explanations.

I'll get through the presentation and, again, let council have any other comments that they want to make and then I'll open it up to the audience.

So again, it's, the document has been out for about two to three weeks, so, and it's in your packet. I hope everybody here is here because they've read it and they have something that they, they want to say, so.

Okay. So I'm going to try to go through this fairly quickly because again, it's just a
summary, a reiteration of what's in the document and
give council and then the audience a chance to say
something.

One of the major points that we had to
wrestle with when we were putting together this
vision statement is what are the user's needs for
the 21st Century Government information access and
to Federal Government information. And these are
the 11 issues that we feel that need to be grappled
with. It's, it's -- they're big issues. They can't
all be tackled at once. They can't be all tackled
by everybody at the same time.

So, it needs to be a collaborative
effort between lots of different groups, technical,
traditional library service groups, organizations.
And as I said, some of them may need to be worked in
concert with each other, but they, we need to be
able to focus on these 11 things.

Documented metadata standards. What is
a document. What's the metadata, what's the level
of metadata that we need. Centralized coordinating
agency, what's its role, how is it shaped, what does
that agency do for the user, for the program if it,
as the program continues to evolve, what does the, what's the agency's role within the Federal Government.

Public tools development. Again, as electronic information evolves, we need tools to not only provide the information to the end user, but to be able to, to retrieve the information, put the information together so that it can be provided to the end user in the ways that we see the needs are locally. It just can't be this uniform delivery anymore.

It was so easy in the world of the book that it was printed, it was bound and you got it and that's the way it is. And now information is, is so flexible and movable, but you need tools to be able to do that.

The issue of electronic deposit. I actually had someone come up to me this morning and say, well, my library can't, can't do this. And I said well, not every library can do this. But the idea is which libraries can and with electronic deposit, how is this information shared, how do we continue to provide services with electronic
deposit.

Version control. Version control. A lot, yes, this will be a session, another, a session -- no. Just one of those issues that it's still trying to get our hands around it and, again, I mean council has the, the, or is lucky enough to have someone like Pete on council that at least gets us out of the dark hole sometimes, because it is such a large issue. It's probably one of the largest and toughest issues that I think not only us, but as the future digital system starts to evolve, how do we deal with this.

Authenticity. Again, we've talked a lot about authenticity, but it is a base requirement that is needed and how is authenticity carried out in the 21st Century in the electronic environment.

Supportive legislation, you, and that goes from the range of appropriations all the way down to the unspeakable, but it has to be said every once in a while, is Title 44 worth -- is Title 44 still relevant, are there other ways around Title 44, is there a time at which Title 44 can be looked at, is the environment ever going to be
perfect for any kind of revision of Title 44;
probably not.

But at what point do you take the risk
that you have to revise Title 44, or attempt to
revise Title 44.

Public education, and one of the things
I want to do when I go back to this is these are not
in any order of priority, this is just a list
because as I see public education, I think public
education should really be at the top, if not first,
maybe in the first three because this is a public
program.

There needs to be public education.

They are the -- it's the public that is going to
continue to create the rationale for this. It's not
our administrations. Is our administrations
creating a rationale for this, are our libraries
creating a rationale for this, are we creating a
rationale for this, and when we do that, is that the
appropriate voice that should be heard all the time.

So, public education, it's the, it's not
only that warm fuzzy, but it's that necessary part
that we really need to start sticking our necks out
and working on.

Again, informing our library administrations, this is something that we've been trying to do for the last dozen years, some of us are successful, some of us are least successful. The problem is our libraries are going through a great deal of change. This program is going through a great deal of change.

In some ways I can step back and I can have sympathy with my library administration where everything is just twirling around every day. The thing is that we need to still keep communicating with them, not let that whirl-wind around them keep us from trying to get a voice. And unfortunately Denise is not here, she's battling allergies, she's going to try to be here later, so looking forward to Denise giving us a perspective on this. And of course we have Rich and Linda who's also on council who can give us that administrative perspective of what it's really like to try to communicate, so.

Excellent public service. Bottom line, it is a service program and the public and the rationale for the program is based on excellent
service. How do you get that? Training, training, training.

Preservation of print. Yes, we're talking about the electronic environment, but you cannot leave those legacy collections behind and how do we do that, what's the amount of energy, what's the amount of time that we spend doing that, who does that, how can we share that process?

In putting together this document, council came up with seven goals and some of them are quite lengthy. But as I said, what I want to do is I want to go through each goal and if there's additional comments from council, I've kind of gotten my comments in as we've gone into, through the 11 issues, but I'm going to invite each member of council if they want to make a comment. Some of the members on council have had more experience which -- with each of these goals and have taken ownership of these. So, I do want to give them a chance to respond to this. This also gives me a chance to talk a little less at this point.

First, respond to or anticipate U.S. citizens' need for Government information when
and where it's needed by providing multiple access points to a network of experts.

And I know that you can quibble with the word citizen and I don't want to quibble over that word citizen. I don't want to get into wordsmithing on that. I couldn't think of a better word. I don't think we could think of a better word. You could say user's needs, but this is U.S. Government information and, but.

Any comments from council?

MR. WARNICK: Yes, thanks, Bill. This

is Walt Warnick from the Department of Energy.

I just want to make an overall comment that these are, this is a vision document and we're talking about goals, but embedded within these goals are some points which are not too far a field from actions and I think where we all want to end up eventually is actions, actions that can help the Federal depository library program survive and actually prosper in this era of electronic media.

And even within, within this first goal, also within some of the other goals there are items that get close to calling for actions and we're
submitting these as speaking on behalf of council, if I may, I think that we encourage the GPO and Federal depository libraries to take these items to the next step and make them real actions, to the extent that that's possible.

For example, in the first goal, there's an item council recommends that GPO establish a network of experts in specialized areas of excellence and it goes on from there and which might be an easy, low-hanging fruit, if you will, action that GPO might take in concert with Federal Depository Librarians. Thank you.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill. I'd like to second what Walt mentioned. This document was put together to provide a consistent vision across the library community as well as for GPO, make sure we're all on the same page on how things we see will transpire in the future.

I would urge you to take this back to your respective institutions, discuss it with your directors, determine how is this going to impact my library in the future in things like budgets, how is it going to affect our work in the future.
How can we get our library to the future so the United States can remain a world leader in library science?

MR. SUDDUTH: Geoff.

MR. SWINDELLS: Just a couple comments on this first goal.

In making this a reality, we're probably going to have to struggle on some issues like what do we mean by an expert, who decides, what is the nature of expertise. Is expertise really what we mean? And how do we engender expertise in different areas within the community. And so I think implementing this, it will be important to figure those things out.

What I'm a little afraid of in talking to people is they don't feel they are experts, so I think we need to define what we mean in a way that allows the most participation by folks who feel comfortable in helping in different areas, different subject areas, different format types, things like that.

MR. SUDDUTH: And I guess what I would like to add to that is leaders aren't necessarily
experts. Leaders are the ones that are just willing
to open their mouth up and that sometimes the
leaders need to listen to who the real experts are
and they aren't necessarily the noisiest people in
the room, they're usually the more thoughtful people
in the room.

Susan.

MS. TULIS: Susan Tulis, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
The other thing I would like to remind people of is that what I don't want to see happening is everybody going home and assuming that the items in there for action are GPO's responsibility.

I think some of them are the libraries', some may be GPO's, some are, would be a partnership between the two, but I, but bear in mind that it is not, our report is not saying that GPO is responsible for doing all of these things.

MR. SUDDUTH: Anybody else?

If not, I'll move on to goal two.

MS. MILLER: No. No. I haven't had enough coffee, unlike Evelyn. I brought my four cups.
This is Ann Miller, from Duke.

And I think one thing that we could look at is the program or the grant that my colleague on my left here, Tim, has started in the western states and I think we can look towards that program as a method of engendering and training expertise among both the Federal Depository libraries, but also to our extended community of public libraries, because I think one of the things that I would like to see coming out of this goal is a greater understanding of the use and need to use Government information on -- by the entire profession of librarianship.

So I think one of the things for us to realize is we already are experts, a lot of us, just by the very fact that we're sitting in this room makes us an expert, and that how can we share that expertise and extend it and how do we make it available and how do we promote it, suggest that people come to us for special needs.

MR. SUDDUTH: Anybody else?

Okay.

Second goal, providing access to information in appropriate formats. Fairly simple,
fairly straightforward. Anybody want to make more, make it more complicated?

MS. PARKER: Oh, yes, of course, Marian Parker, with the law library community, specifically from Wake Forest and I think that as council and through all of the discussions, we really do understand what we're talking about.

I want to reiterate the need for each of us in our own spheres of influence and GPO in its work with acquiring information have the continuing dialogue with the producers of primary sources of the law so the, the decisions from the Courts, the statutes from Congress, the rules and regulations from the agencies, that we help those people understand why it is now time for them to authorize their documents in digitized format to be made official.

And when GPO gets the ability to truly authenticate everything, have version control over it and whatever signatures or certifications that they decide are appropriate and the various entities can approve, that's when everybody who is issuing this primary information, primary sources of the law
will be comfortable. And once that happens, I, we're all going to see a seat change and then all of the various entities will be able to accept the digital formats from the other entity and we as libraries will have more and more ability to move to a digital environment and not have to have all of the paper.

And so this one really does, I believe, require effort on behalf of all of us. It isn't just GPO's job. It really is the job of --
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MS. MILLER: It really is the job of all of us who work with judges, who work with people in the agencies who are doing the hearings, who are promulgating the rules and regulations, that we can all write to our Congress people and tell them why we think this is important for the long-term health of the availability of Government information.

And I've always thought it was interesting that Congress says let's digitize everything except exempt our own publications, you know, we want them all in paper in perpetuity. So
we have a real opportunity with Congress to influence them as to why the time has come for us to move to this environment.

And until each of these issuing entities authorize their own documents as official in a digital format, we will be required to produce it in paper, house it in paper and make it available to the citizens in paper.

MR. SUDDUTH: Geoff.

MR. SWINDELLS: Since I'm speaking, I guess this makes me a non-expert, so I just want to get that out there.

I think that the, the spirit behind this goal is to find the most appropriate format for different circumstances and to make that possible.

So on occasion that will mean coming up with ways to produce print in a way that we easily, cost effectively that we can deliver to users when they need print.

But it also means experimenting with new technologies that make the electronic format possible, so, for instance, at the University of Missouri, we're starting to talk about experimenting
with some of the new E ink electronic paper readers, like the Iliad, the new Sony book as ways to sort of make electronic documents portable and usable in a way that might be better than sort of carrying around a laptop in the field or something.

So I think that we have to be very creative when we start to look at what the most appropriate formats are and how best to provide that format to users.

MS. PARKER: This is Marian, again. I was speaking -- and I agree with you, Geoff, absolutely, I'm not disagreeing at all. I'm moving into another point of this.

My comments were specifically about legal information, primary sources of the law. I cannot speak to many other portions of information that's published by GPO and that are used in larger depositories, even smaller ones, by all different kinds of groups of people. I couldn't tell you a thing about maps and whether maps have to always be in paper or whether they are going to be better electronically or some combination thereof.

And so when we say in this goal
appropriate format, we truly are talking about assessing what the users need, how the information is published, how people use it and how we can make it the best way for them to use it in this time, not the best way, you know, 50 years ago, but the best way today and in the foreseeable future. And as the FDsys is planning the flexibility to evolve as the technology evolves around us.

But what I said about our responsibility for communicating with the promulgators of the primary sources of law, I think it gives — it reminds us that each of us in our sphere of influence need to be understanding from our users and from the producers of the information that they use, how best is this information, what is the best format for this information.

You know, it used to be you had to have the paper if you were out in the field doing any kind of fieldwork, but there's so much that's been moved to a digital format and people have their PDAs or their little laptops and, you know, again, I'll speak about legal information; I'll ask the rest of Council and every one of you sitting in there to
help all of us, including GPO, figure out what the
formats are that really, really, really are needed.

MR. SUDDUTH: Evelyn.

MS. FRANGAKIS: I want to shift the
discussion a little bit to preservation and just
make a note here that while we'll discuss it more in
the next goal, that preservation supports and feeds
access and I want to applaud GPO's effort to create
a dark archive for the tangible collections. I
think that is extremely important for the historical
collection.

In 1992, GPO, with the National Archives
and the Library of Congress was charged to implement
for the Federal Government the permanent paper law
and to ensure that Government publications were
printed on permanent paper. So we have a level of
assurance that since that time materials produced in
tangible form are, in fact, going to remain stable,
both chemically and mechanically stable over time.

The older materials may need a little
bit of help for the long-term preservation effort
and that help can take a variety of forms.

With paper we have had an opportunity to
take a bit longer to think about now we're going to preserve it. In an electronic environment, we will not have that luxury. Preservation, as I said, supports access and in order to have that access in an electronic environment, we will need to be sure that we are not only providing authentic content, but that that content is actively maintained in order for it to be accessible.

So I wanted to make those points and also applaud GPO for its efforts and ask the community to continue to support GPO's efforts to preserve the Government's information.

As I'm sure many of you know, the National Archives preserves a fraction of what the Government produces and while Government publications do fall into the archival category of responsibility, the fact is NARA will only preserve a sampling of that material, so it really goes back to agencies and GPO to take some responsibility for making sure the Government's information continues to survive over time.

MR. SUDDUTH: Ann.
MS. MILLER: I'd like to sort of address two different things here because I think one of the major things that I feel like this goal gets to or we need to get to within this goal is a matter of trust and a matter of, is, really is a matter of trust.

And one of the things that I've been -- I hear and that I think we need to start and we, meaning the community, is to start thinking and trusting each other, our institutions that we -- so that we can trust a dark archive, that we could trust an organization such as what they're trying to do in Kansas and Nebraska where there's a trust factor among the depositories, among the regionals that the information will be there. There's an agreement, it's set, you will be able to get what you need and that's the trust thing.

In research libraries, a number of us are members of the Center for Research Libraries and we trust that we can go to Chicago and borrow that microfilm of the State Department files from 1944. These things are -- we already do this in our community. We trust that we will lend each other
materials when we have them.

And that is, in my mind, a lot of what this is about. Then that goes to the, mostly the archive, the archive proposals, the need for understanding that there are, we have to have a central location. We have to have redundancy of that central location, which would be the FDsys. We need to make sure that we have advice and council such as Evelyn's regarding preservation of these materials.

So I think the whole trust thing is one that I think we need to take home and think about very carefully as, you know, do we, can we do this and I think we can. We have to. I mean even an institution like Duke where we have a huge storage module, almost full, and we're building a second storage module.

We also are starting to look at space needs, is this the most effective way for our students and faculty and in my case, my public to access the materials, are there alternatives that are more effective and efficient and can I trust UNC, which I do, my regional, to hold things for me.
The other thing I wanted to kind of talk a little bit about was the thing of, the issue of format that Marian brought up and one of the really tricky formats as you've heard me talk about before is maps and geographic information.

And I think there, one of the things I'm going to do is I happen to have in my department someone who is fairly influential in map circles or at least knows a lot of people and kind of say, you know, Mark, we need a standard, we need advice from geographers, from geologists and scientists, what do you need us to save?

I could guess, but if we, we can't guess. We need to know. And we need to know how to save it. What formats do they foresee. What's most appropriate for them. And so we have to communicate with our faculty, our students, our public and our colleagues and I really think in this case, in the geographic information, we've got to find some standards and we've got to start establishing them if they aren't there already and then holding ourselves to them.

MR. SUDDUTH: Pete.
MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

I'd like to second Ann's comments, the -- many of you are from some of the leading academic institutions in the world and a lot of you have expertise on campus and computer sciences, in geography and a lot of it is talking to other parts of your University to get them to understand the issues and what you face with, you know, library science in dealing with things like maps and other formats.

Some of this is going to require experimentation and don't be afraid of, you know, possible failure or less desired results. We have to start somewhere. We have to get there somehow.

So, I would urge you to work with the rest of your institution to try and obtain that. Situations like Web crawling, allottable goal, and we'll talk about that a little bit more for GPO is, the results were less than desired.

We'll go back and we'll keep trying until we get the desired results.

MR. SUDDUTH: If there's no one else, I do want to add that Ann brought up a very important
point about trust and then also talked about formats
and it's not that I don't trust you all, my
colleagues.

I think what we're all grappling with is
the formats and that we have to become the formats,
as they change, we have to become, they have to
become more trusted and we have to become more
comfortable with those formats. As we transition
and have been transitioning into this electronic
format, we're worried about what we've left behind.

The next transition is going to come
even quicker though, when's the transition to video,
audio and when is that, when is your faculty, your
students, your public going to want to come in and
say we have the paper or we can download this to
your MP3 player and are you ready for that, are we
ready for that, storage wise, access wise and can we
trust ourselves with that format.

So.

MS. PARKER: Bill, this is Marian, and I
want to make another couple comments based on this
theme of trust and appropriate format and, again,
the law library community when I came in to this
environment was feeling, and I'm generalizing here and anybody else from the law library community will be welcome to pitch in at whatever point, but was very uncomfortable with the fact that we might move to digital documents of primary sources of the law before we had the assurance that we could authenticate these documents, certify these documents, version control these documents and GPO listened to the concerns of the community and stepped back from the rapid transition from paper to digital for some of these things that are just so critical in the legal community.

And, and that built a level of trust that we are being listened to. And I think it's a great example of the interaction between our community of documents specialists and GPO and its experts and I want to thank GPO for stepping back and moving with caution for the materials that are so essential in the environment in which I work and it makes me believe that we can trust them to do that with the appropriate input for the other items of information about which we are so concerned.

MR. SUDDUTH: Okay.
Let's, next goal. Ensure continuing access to digitally available Government information.

Rich.

MR. AKEROYD: This is Richard Akeroyd from the New Mexico State Library.

I'm interested in this, in this goal from a variety of perspectives and I think the conversation of, about trust just, just maybe is a good segway into it.

The emphasis on this goal is largely, or at least in implementing this goal if you read all the parts of it, seems to largely focus on Federal agencies and I think that's appropriate for the broad leadership that we need.

But in, in a couple of other previous meetings I've commented on, on things, models that exist that can bring the States and State information, State Government information into this reflecting on Bruce's comments on Sunday.

I think there's a model like the U.S. newspaper project really worked very well in distributing responsibility around the country and
very effectively and I think relatively cost, cost
effectively, but not a whole lot of money was spent
on that project, relatively speaking.

And I think that this goal gives us an
opportunity and gives GPO working together with the
National Archives, Library of Congress and others
the opportunity to look at that model and distribute
a lot of responsibility, things like the digital
archive program that we and a few other States are
doing right now with State Government information.
We've already begun to move over into including
Federal fugitive documents in our digital archive
program.

And I think that we can look at that and
take the opportunity that this goal suggests to
really put together a program that's nationwide and
distributes a lot of responsibility for getting this
done and I think you can assure a really reasonable
success for this kind of goal. Reasonable chance at
success I should say.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other comments,
Council?

Okay. Provide excellent training to
deepen and expand knowledge of Government information resources via excellent training. Boy that was late night typing there.

MS. TULIS: There are a couple of mistakes in there.

MR. SUDDUTH: Are you going to point those out for the rest of us?

MS. TULIS: I didn't know if you wanted to wordsmith.

In the second paragraph under the rationale you've gotten list the expertise, there's another, I think when we were re-doing it some words got left in.

MR. SUDDUTH: Okay.

MS. TULIS: Just know that we'll fix them.

MS. MILLER: Is this version control?

MS. TULIS: Yes.

MS. MILLER: Are we in version control?

MR. SUDDUTH: Well, you know, someone did point out that of the, of all the names on the front cover there's only one that's misspelled and that's mine. And I've spent 45 years re-spelling my
last name, automatically, and I can't do it in my
own brain.

Yes. Ann.

MS. MILLER: I haven't commented much on
this during our process because I took ownership of
the next goal, but one thing that strikes me as I
look at this and as I was listening to Tim's
presentation in the regional meeting and just
starting to think about where I need to be going
after I get off council, because, you know, this is
a full-time job, I think one of the things that
people can take away from this goal immediately is a
commitment to ourselves to continue our own
training, to every day learn something new.

I mean to sit down and look at a new
Government Website, this Summer I spent a lot of
time playing around on the OSTI Websites, partly
because I admire what Walter has done, and I was
interested in sort of extending my understanding of
what this whole deep Web thing was because I didn't
understand what it was, really.

And I found that as I did that, I could
use it, actually, you know, I got reference
questions where I went oh, yeah, let's look at science.gov. I'll bet you we can find something there.

So I think that continuing our own personal training can be a very first step and this is a place where each and every one of us can step forward and say I will do this, this is something I can do. And it also benefits our institution, so if they start to wonder, you know, well, why are you spending a half an hour every day playing on the Web, I'm not playing on the Web, I'm learning, I'm training myself.

Put it in your goals. I have to put, I have to create annual goals for myself, one of my annual goals should, should be by the end of this coming year I will have done blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

So, and training, train myself, I will expand my knowledge of this, that and the other. So I mean I think this is not something where we can sit and wait for GPO, University of Colorado and its associates to come to us and bless us with training. We can go out and do this right
now.

MS. PARKER: Marian Parker again, I'll wait for Tim, okay.

MR. BYRNE: Since Ann keeps talking about me, I'll have to say something.

As a regional, I, you know, frequently meet with my selectees and I say, you know, what, what do you want from your regional. What is, you know, what services can I provide for you and at one meeting I asked this and they gave me a list, they said training, training and training.

And so a little over a year ago, University of Colorado hired a new grant writer and so I sat down with her to talk about, you know, what my goals were, what I wanted to, you know, hopefully do, and it was training for Government informational librarians.

And so we started working on a grant proposal and as more and more of it developed, I really realized I couldn't separate training of Government information librarians, the selective depository librarians from training librarians in general. We really had to link that together.
So essentially the grant that I wrote turned out to be a train the trainers program for Government information librarians that the second half is then we'll turn around and go out and train the non-depository librarians. I think it's really crucial to have those things linked together in their plans.

The other thing that I found interesting as I was researching, you know, getting information to put in the grant to justify this and looking for things that said that this is needed, that depository librarians want training and I went into the ARL survey that Bill was involved with and there was some questions there that ask depository librarians what their training needs were and who they expected to do the training.

And I found it fascinating that they, most depository librarians expected GPO to provide their training and there was not anywhere near as high a confidence level in the regionals providing training, but GPO does not have the expertise that we really need to train most of our people.

We have that expertise and so, again,
we're in a partnership. We have to work on it. We can't just expect GPO to do it.

MR. SUDDUTH: Tim, there's some fine print at the end of that survey that any profit from this has to be kicked back to the authors, by the way.

MR. BYRNE: Okay, well.

MR. SUDDUTH: Beth, and I will expect -- no, I'm glad to hear, thank you for saying that because that's the first time that I've heard that what we did was of some use and that, that just makes me feel good with that, so.

Yes, Marian.

MS. PARKER: I want to speak about even more informal programs. I mean Ann's talking about self-education, Tim's got this wonderful grant for this wonderful formal training program and I think there's sort of this in between here that we all can commit to.

I know lots of law libraries do law for the non-law librarian sessions and there's a lot of good literature out there for people to pull on. And I would encourage any of you all who want a
session like that to contact your nearest law
library that's a depository and at the same time, I
would like to be able to turn around and say to Ann,
to Beth, to, you know, to the people across the
campus, you know, we don't know anything about the
census or about agriculture or about whatever topic
the latest paper that one of our faculty members is
doing, so I want to be able to call on our fellow
documents people and ask for some informal training.

And then I also want to tell you about a
situation that Marcia Baker, who is my documents
librarian and in the audience did when she was going
to do some self-education, she went to one of the
agency Websites and was finding it not quite so easy
to use and so she called the agency's Web master to
get some help.

And they began a dialogue about, you
know, using this information and how users are using
it and what he could do to make it a better product
and he actually ended up asking Marcia to be an
advisor. And it's amazing how responsive some of
these agency people will be if you have a discussion
with them. And that, that allows us to train them
and them to train us in ways that I think we don't necessarily generally think of when we talk about good training for good documents information. So I encourage us to do that as well, because it really has been very fruitful and I commend Marcia in public for what she's done.

MR. SUDDUTH: Rich.
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MR. AKEROYD: Marian, just a quick follow-up.

In New Mexico the State library has partnered with the State law library and the law library at the University of New Mexico to do training for public librarians around the State. It's been very successful and it's another model that I think we can all look at.

State library agencies do a lot of this and I think just adding documents which we do as well, but your focus on the law, I thought I should at least put a plug in there for that kind of a model.

MS. PARKER: Yeah, that's great. That's great.

MR. SUDDUTH: Tim.
MR. BYRNE: I, I've just gotten a grant that gives me a lot of money to do training, but it isn't required and I, we've also had success, in August we hosted a third five-State Government documents conference, this is something that Janet Fisher really got started in Arizona, we've had one in Santa Fe. Now Boulder. The thing that did amaze me about this process, how much we were able to accomplish with absolutely no budget at all.

I always sort of felt the whole thing reminded me of a Mickey Rooney, Judy Garland movie where the kids decide let's put on a circus and that's what we do, let's put on a conference.

So, it's really not hard to do.

MS. MILLER: Well, one more thing and it's being done. All of us have State associations, I believe, and one of the things I sort of committed myself to do, I no longer attend ALA for a variety of reasons, but I have made a commitment now that I will attend my NCLA document sections meeting every year, which I hadn't been doing.

And that's a place where I can network with my colleagues across my State. I can present
on things and if I fall flat on my face, there's
only, you know, 20 or 30 people out there laughing,
not 130.

And, but I, and we do a lot of training. I think that's where some of the major training has to happen is at the State level, you know, and some of the larger, the larger western States that gets more difficult but, you know, in California, if you're in Eureka, you're not going to drive to San Diego on the spur of the moment to go to a training session, but I think we have technology that can facilitate that kind of interaction at a State level or a regional level.

MR. SWINDELLS: Bill.

MR. SUDDUTH: Geoff.

MR. SWINDELLS: I think this goal links up very strongly with the network --
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MR. SWINDELLS: I think this goal links up very strongly with the network of expert's goal and over the summer I read a fascinating book which I downloaded for free online by a legal scholar I
believe at Yale called, and I'll mispronounce his
first name, it's Yochi. I'm not sure how you
pronounce his name, Bankler called the Wealth of
Networks and it's a very interesting work at the
shift from broadcast models to peer-to-peer models.
And I think that when we talk about
training, we've tended to think in terms of
broadcast models. We've tended to think of the
experts sort of giving us training in large forms,
sending that out, whether that be GPO or others.
And that's actually a very effective
means of training and I don't discount that and I
think we need to continue that.
But I also think we need to find ways
and technologies that support sort of peer-to-peer
training because I think that there's a lot of
expertise, often not recognized as such, in the
community that can be brought to bear in sort of all
of us training each other.
And I think we need to explore some of
those models, so I think these two goals really link
up in interesting ways.
MR. SUDDUTH: Any other comments?
Before we go on, what I get from part of this discussion, too, is that we do a lot of good things, but we don't have any measure for it.

And in some ways I would either like to challenge us or challenge GPO or work with GPO to make this a measure so that we know. I mean yes, it's good to know about the, the quality stuff that's done, but the quantity I think is out there and it's, it's massive. And that if we can somehow just measure that, it not only will make us feel good, but it's something that shows that the message is getting out and that there is an additional value to this program and that we are touching other people, so.

Provide high quality descriptive tools or access to all FDLP publications, portals and information products.


Enhance collaboration or coordination of effort among Federal depository libraries, non-depository libraries, GPO, agencies and cultural memory organizations that deal with Internet
And again, I mean might not, saying Internet resources may be limiting ourselves, electronic or information resources, so, but. MS. STIERHOLZ: Yeah, I think this is potentially an area for great success and I think it ties into the experts and the training. We may have experts outside of the depository library program that depository librarians can lean on and learn from. There's lots of training opportunities that are available from these groups and then I also think for things like digitizing lots of Government information. I mean it, we've talked about GPO doing it, but there's no way in my lifetime GPO will get that done, or any one organization. I mean it's not GPO alone, I don't think any one organization can do it all. I think the collections are spread out, the information. Like Bruce was saying, there's lots of Government information out there that was never in the depository program that's all over the place and I think they are in depository library programs but
they are also in all kinds of other locations.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete. I just wanted to mention that I think it would be very beneficial to work as Bruce mentioned both ways between the Federal depository libraries and other sources and GPO may need to work out how they can put authenticated sources as well as unauthenticated sources in their collections to be able to be part of an overall federated capability to deliver this information and have people determine what's good enough for them.

Originally Bruce was very concerned about making sure that they are the authentic source of information for Government and that needs to be weighed heavily on how you present the information, citing sources, citing where the information comes from and the level of authenticity and official stature of the document.

So, I think that involves a little bit of policy with regard to GPO in order for partners to step up and assist GPO in building things like the retrospective collections.

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other comment? Okay.
And finally, expand awareness of both the Federal depository library program and Government information generally via excellent public relations and marketing.

And again, as we had with the discussion about training, it doesn't have to be a huge campaign. It doesn't have to be national. Sometimes it's local and with your users that is the best, but making that connection and that awareness and taking advantage of the electronic environment. In fact, it gets pretty, it gets easier to have people know about things and a lot, you know, sometimes it's things you wouldn't necessarily have thought in the past that you don't think people knew and what I think, what I'm thinking of is like U tube, you know, why, you know, there's so much on U tube that is silly and entertainment, but there are mechanisms for getting the message out.

Other comments?

MS. MILLER: Well the only thing I would, Ann Miller, only thing I would add is there are libraries who are doing a very good job of this
and they are often ones like the Benton Harbors and
the New Mexico State Library and in my State I went
to a session of NCLA Government information section
a couple years ago and it was UNC Wilmington. And
I'm like who knew. They have, they have an outreach
librarian and that is her job, is to outreach to the
community, to other parts of the University.

And so I'm sitting there thinking, why
am I not doing this? I mean I'm busy, but this is
part of my job. So I, I think looking around for
models, that they might be closer than you think.
And besides Wilmington is nice, I need to go visit.

MR. SUDDUTH: Okay.

MR. BYRNE: I just wanted to share a
little story. As a result of the grant, I got a
call from a reporter of the local newspaper who
wanted to interview me about expanding the press
release that the University had sent out and so she
was asking several questions and I was having a
great time, you know, expounding on Government
information and then she stopped and said did you
just hear a lot of noise here in the newsroom? And

I said, well, no. And she said, oh, well, I'm
probably going to have to call you back if I have any more questions because I think there's just been an arrest in the Ramsey case. I have no idea what happened to that article.

MR. SUDDUTH: You got lost in that news cycle.

MS. STIERHOLZ: There's a few things we can't compete against.

MR. SUDDUTH: Okay, any other comments? The challenge, one of the challenges is collaboration for within the Federal depository library program, the collaborating with our non-depository partners, collaboration with, among and between our library associations to work together to solve the problems, go over the issues, work with us as members to get those, for us as members of these associations to communicate what we feel the issues are and to have our associations work with their energy and their expertise, not only within their associations, but within the resources that they can bring to us to get our message, particularly here in Washington, but also within the rest of our associations.
Working in collaboration with the Federal Government information community. We do have some very strong partners. We, we are comfortable with them. We keep coming back to them. We have Walt, OCDI, Census, but it's the challenge then becomes working with those who have been difficult in the past, trying to break down, continue to break down those barriers, particularly when it's information that we know that our community, that our users need to get to.

The next steps. These are questions more for everybody back from council to the audience, but that we would like people to take home. And you've seen, you've seen and you've heard some of these as we've gone through this discussion. What is the future of Government information services in your library and in your community and for your community.

Which of the 11 issues can you, your library or your library organization can take leadership, if not take leadership, provide some expertise. If you're the expert, as I said earlier, you know, the expert isn't necessarily that person
who stands up at the microphone and yells.

It's that thoughtful person, you don't have to stand up at the microphone, you can communicate to the leaders, explain to the leaders, sometimes is, what it is is we're doing this and this is how we did it and you still might get a glazed look from that person, they might not be awake, they might not have had their coffee, or you might have to dumb it down for us, so.

Which of the seven goals can you, your library and your library organization can take leadership. Really, again, this is more of a charge. Take this document, you, you're here, you've heard a lot of information, you will continue to hear a lot of information, a lot of programs that, projects that GPO is working with and where does your library fit into the future of this program.

And that is really the most important question because the program is your library and if your library doesn't have a place in this program, then the program doesn't have a place in your community.
So you need to think about that and you have to take sometimes some risks and challenges, you have to work as partners with your other, within your State, within your library and within, again, your associations to accomplish that.

Now, this I did, as you can tell from one of the earlier slides, I did fairly late last night and, yes, council was, stayed and they talked and all that, so if council looks strange when they see these, it's because this is the first time they've seen them, too.

Some of the issues, goals that we have within council. Communicate the issues and goals in this document to the library associations. Communicate issues and goals to the new GPO administration as you made plainly clear and aware is that Bruce has already announced his retirement back in April.

We, there will be either a new public printer or an interim public printer. Judy made her announcement last month, so there's a whole new administration that we will need to communicate with, educate, along with the continuing staff at
GPO. And we need to do this in a way that we can keep this progress going and not create the friction that will cause things to stop or slow down too much. Because there has been progress that's been made.

Yes, things do slow down as you transition, but we need to keep the ball rolling. Any comment, does anybody on council want to make any comments? Okay.

One of the things that council has talked about is going to a next steps document, going down to some detailed things, but again, we encourage you to provide us with what you think some next stops are and that when we open the discussion, we can start to gather some of that.

Again, it's part of that we want to keep this process moving. It's not that -- it's not going to be a list, again, that we can present to GPO and say you've got to do this, it can't be something the council can do, it's going to be something that creating, again, better defining that environment for action that Walt was talking about, that Pete was talking about earlier, where are the
actions that we can take, focus our energy and also as a list like that grows, it's going to have to be prioritized.

What is going to be best for the program, what can be done or who can take ownership and leadership either within the program, within your State, within your library.

Going back to that expertise.

Okay. Any comments from council before I open it up to the floor? Evelyn.

MS. FRANGAKIS: I, in addition to applauding GPO's efforts in moving the FDLP into the 21st Century, I want to urge all of you here today to support GPO's efforts in all of the endeavors that they're moving forward with.

As I said earlier, preservation supports access. Preservation in the digital environment is tremendously complex and GPO has undertaken it in a very responsible and systematic manner and has entered this endeavor at a time when as we said in the vision document, there's no single set of best practices.

In order for the FDLP to succeed in the
future, in order for you to be able to provide good programs to your citizens, GPO will need to be able to preserve that information for you to use. And I want to say that it will need your support to, through associations, through your directors, through fund, people who have the ability to help fund these efforts because they are complex technologically and they will require a tremendous amount of resources in order to move them forward to a point where they can succeed and where we will have the assurance that these programs will go far into the future.

MR. SUDDUTH: Geoff.

MR. SWINDELLS: In terms of our next steps, I just want to sort of echo something that Pete said earlier. The future is not going to be created at this table. The future is going to be created on the ground in your institutions and so I think that one of council's responsibilities in developing next steps is to reach out to the community, to find those folks doing interesting and forward-looking projects and to help them bring those projects to the attention of the rest of the
community as models. And there are lots and lots of models.

The future is completely open, so I think we need to really reach out into the community and find those, those areas of excellence, and make sure that everyone knows about them.

MR. SUDDUTH: Tim.

MR. BYRNE: Well the goals that you had, talking about communication, are things that I think are really crucial.

Again, referring back to my recent experience with the grant, I, my communication had been with the depository librarians in telling them, you know, when I was writing the grant, when I was putting it in and that I got it. But I was relying on them to communicate with their directors and in a meeting with the depository library director, when I updated her on what was going on, she was very excited, but she was also annoyed because she really hadn't heard much about it.

So I realized, you know, in this, in terms of the grant, I've got to communicate directly to the directors. And then I realized, you know, as
a regional I've been remiss in not doing that.

That's something that you can't rely on every
depository librarian to have a good relationship, to
have good communication and if we want this document
taken out, I'm going to be communicating with every
depository library director in Colorado, Wyoming to
make sure that they do get it.

And one of the things that was, this is
a little trivial thing, but it would have been
helpful if I could have gotten the list of E-mail
addresses for depository library directors.
Academic libraries put their directories on the Web,
public libraries don't. And --

MR. SUDDUTH: Any other comments from
Council?

Okay, we have about 10 minutes that we
can take comments from the audience. Again, I want
to point out that if we don't get to you or cannot
answer a question from you, there are the cards and
again, council would love to hear your comments or
get your written comments.

Barbie.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of
Virginia.

I could not say something and Tim's was a perfect segway to what I was going to say because in goal seven, one of the, I mean one of the, one of the aims of the public relations and marketing which is in the rationale is definitely library administrations and I think it ties in with what Ann said about the outreach portion of all of our jobs and to what Jose was saying on Sunday afternoon about organizationally explaining that or somehow conveying that to our administrations, that that is a part of what we do and I think it ties also into the training thing.

I mean if we do that, then that sort of is an outreach action that gives our libraries good PR, which all our directors want. I mean it just all sort of ties in together. But that library administration support is very important in what Tim was saying, you know, that's a portion that I think is, we can all do a better job at and many of these goals kind of tie into that, so that action.

And then also, of course, to the funding agencies as Evelyn mentioned. You know,
individually, I mean we talked about library associations, the group things, but every one of us in this room can individually do some of the supporting and outreach and PR to our legislative people in Washington and at the State level, so.

MR. HEMPHILL: Barbie, yeah, this is Pete Hemphill.

One thing that we've received requests on council for are tools to help market your institutions more effectively. The vision document is a good tool to help you do that, if you can take that to your directors and to your funding people and say this is what we're trying to accomplish and this is what we're trying to do, these are clear goals of what we're facing to get our libraries to the 21st Century.

I think it will be very effective in helping communicate to your funding folks as well as directors the information that they need to help make those funding decisions.

MR. SUDDUTH: Ann Marie?

I appreciate that this is a vision document and, therefore, it is covering very broad concepts and I really appreciate the amount of work that went into it, but there are two broad concepts that are somewhat intertwined that I don't see reflected here.

One of them is there's a reference to multiple points of access to the system of Government information, but nowhere is there a reference to equitable access to this kind of information and that's always been a cornerstone of the FDLP and I don't think any of us really want to leave it behind, but I would also strongly urge that it be explicitly stated.

The other thing that I don't see reflected and again, I do appreciate that it's a vision document and you're not interested in a lot of the how of what these things are going to be done, but nowhere is there reflected the concept of assessment.

You speak to excellence in marketing and promotion, you speak to excellence in training. You speak most importantly to excellent public service,
but as many a Government agency is loathed to admit, proclaiming one's self to be a center of excellence does not make one a center of excellence.  
And so, again, I appreciate it's a vision document, but somewhere I would really like to see council add in just the concept that assessment needs to be done and needs to speak to the equitable -- the equitable access to the system.  
MR. SUDDUTH: And again, kind of having not seen that myself is, if you look at the statement that comes with the publication, there is mention of equitable access in that, so.  
Yes. It's --  
MS. MILLER: Can I ask a question of Ann?  
MR. SUDDUTH: Yes.  
MS. MILLER: Ann, if you were to include these two in what we have already done, where would you like to see it or do you think that assessment needs to have its own little goal?  
I mean I'm just trying to think where it might fit best and if you need to think about it and get back to me, that would be fine, but I would
really appreciate it because I think these are
really excellent suggestions.

MS. SANDERS: My off-the-cuff response
to that is that where you're referring to multiple
access to the obvious place to put equitable access.

MS. MILLER: Okay.

MS. SANDERS: And there's also somewhere
else you make a reference to the disenfranchised or
the underserved, I can't remember the exact
terminology, but there are a couple of places in the
document where it would fit in very easily and
obviously the service training and the promotions
places are the obvious places to put assessment, but
you might, you know, on a second look you might find
other places to put it, as well.

MS. MILLER: Okay, thank you.

MR. SUDDUTH: Yes.

MS. HYDE: Rebecca Hyde, UC San Diego.

I just wanted to make a comment about
the two goals that are related to education and
training to the public.

One group I wanted to mention that's not
mentioned and maybe you guys discussed it but that I
think is a really important group is library school students. And all those people go on to become often generalists in public libraries, academic libraries and I think that's a great captive audience where you can kind of get in and tell them a little bit about Government documents and especially in those general reference classes that are usually being taught by people who don't really know about Government information.

They usually have a class, you know, one class period on it, but that's a great time I think to get in there and kind of educate those library students who might not take the Government information class or really go on to do anything with Government information, but, and I think a lot of times the people teaching those classes are more than willing to have someone come in and talk about it who's passionate and knowledgeable about it.

MR. SUDDUTH: Thank you for bringing that up and I will tell you you've, to me, it's preaching to the choir because I do teach Government information at my school. And this semester I'm teaching intro to information services and they are
drowning in it. And the reason, the reason I took it on is that 50 percent of our library school graduates are school media and over at least half of my graduate assistants are in the school media track and it dawned on me three or four years ago, the way for me to get the hook into the next user is to make these students the junkies, the Evangelists for that, so I want the middle schoolers and the high schoolers to hear about it before they go Government information, oh, that's in the basement, you know. No, it's in the media center and it's right next to everything else and oh, this is cool, this helps me with my 7th grade project. So, but yes, and again, we periodically have sessions about teaching Government information. Maybe it's time to do another one, so.

Yes, Rich.

MR. AKEROYD: I appreciate that comment as well because those of us who toil in State library agencies find the same thing happening in library schools. Students will often come out of library school never having heard of a State library agency, so it's a, it's a constant battle, as well.
But the comment is really well taken for a variety of reasons.

MR. SUDDUTH: Steve.

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

I'm going back to the assessment again.

It was glaringly missing last go-round, it's still glaringly missing in terms of there are many tasks that seem to have been identified within the vision document, training. To what end?

I mean, you know, is it successful; if, if, yes, I've trained another librarian who, yeah, I know how to do that and no, I never use it and no, when I go on to the third step of an end user, have they received what they need to receive.

So I think the next steps need to be assessment within your various tasks.

The one that I find most missing is the assessment of the program itself. I hit this last time. The only assessment that I see or I believe or I hear or I imply is that we have reduced the fiscal responsibility of the Federal Government to support the dissemination of information to the
I haven't seen an assessment in terms of are we meeting the information needs of the public and if so, how, how do we measure those, you know, what are they to begin with, you know, if we're successful, we have to know what the expectation is before we can say yes, you did it, no, you kind of did it, you missed it completely. And that's not -- I don't see that anywhere yet and I can't point to a document that says, oh, Mr. Congressman, you gave us X amount of money and here's what we did with it and yes, here's our proof that we did something -- (End Track 14 on CD.) (Beginning Track 15 on CD.) MR. HAYES: -- that you wanted us to do, you the big seat for Congress. So I think as a next step in, I'm interested in seeing what Susan and Jeff are going to say in their assessment part. That's I think the glaring missing part right now, particularly assessment beyond the fiscal. (Applause) MR. SUDDUTH: Any other comments?
Council, any last comments? Okay. I have 10:00. Thank you.

I look forward to any additional comments. Again, we do, we are as council want to continue this process and we value any additional comments that you might have as we get into that next steps process. Thank you.

(Short break taken).

MS. PARKER: For today. We're very pleased that GPO offered this session for us because we have lots of thirst for knowledge about what is going on with metadata and cataloging through GPO.

I'm going to introduce the person in charge of these projects and then she's going to introduce the speakers for each of the sections. We will talk about metadata and the new FDsys. We'll talk about the cooperative DTIC, Old Dominion University automated metadata extraction project and we'll talk about Congressional serial cataloging, as well, that's going on at GPO and with partners, I believe.

We're very pleased to have Laurie Beyer Hall who is the Director of Library Technical
Information Services with us today and she has brought a wealth of information. Laurie is going to have three sessions for us and then Laurie, are you going to take questions at the end of each one or at the end of all three?

MS. HALL: Whatever you prefer.

MS. PARKER: Okay, if you guys have burning questions at the end of every presentation, we'll field those, but we'll need to make sure that we leave time for all three sessions, so we'll keep an eye on the clock so that we don't miss anything.

And with this, I'll turn it over to Laurie.

MS. HALL: Good morning. I put this session together because I know there's a lot of stuff that's going on in cataloging and metadata at GPO and we have conference calls with council and GODORT, but a lot of people don't, or hear little bits and tidbits of things that we're doing.

So the purpose of this was to kind of brief you on some of the three key things that are happening at GPO in relation to metadata and cataloging.
We also have the operational forms if you want to talk cataloging to the catalogers. The first session George Barnum is going to talk about metadata and the FDsys. This is something that we're already planning and working on requirements. Then I've invited Gopi Nair from Defense Technical Information Center to talk about their automated metadata extraction project that they've been working on with Old Dominion University and NASA. We're really interested in this. We're working together and investigating that as a possibility to use his search tool and software for automated metadata extraction for doing some cataloging work, particularly for particularly like some of that Web harvested material, so we're really investigating his piece. And then we follow up with Jennifer Davis who's the Manager of Bibliographic Control to actually talk about something we're actually doing and that's how we're cataloging the serial set. So we've got an investigation, a planning effort and actually a going opportunity to talk to you a little bit more about today.
So then there's also some additional handouts. One's called metadata and cataloging questions and we've given that to council, but it's available for you because it's some burning things that we need answered and help on from the community and the council. We're looking for some input on baseline metadata, what everybody will accept and we're also looking on adjusting the cataloging priorities.

We've had it in place for a long time, so we're looking for comments and feedback from the community so we can move forward on some of these. And then we've also prepared an information update. We've been discussing with Mark Sandler and the CIC as the CIC representative to look at some cooperative cataloging efforts.

We were not able to do a lot of cooperative cataloging efforts internally with GPO until we got the ILS. So now we have metadata exchange mechanisms, so there's an information packet, presentation here about some of the things we're investigating and I'm, my name is on the back
I'd like to have some comments because we are looking at doing maybe some mini pilot projects or mini tests of different exchanges and we're going to be working on those, you know, before the holidays, so we really need your feedback on those, too. And these things will all be posted to the national bibliography web page after the council and conference, so with that, that's how the meeting is going to go forward and I'll introduce you to George Barnum.

MR. BARNUM: I just asked Laurie to give me the gong when I've gone over time. So it's a delight to be here and to talk to you about what I've been thinking about for the last, oh, I don't know, as long as I can remember at this point, which is the model for metadata in FDsys.

I want to talk with you about how we view metadata and what role metadata has played in the planning for the system to date over the last couple of years and then give you an idea of what form that thinking and planning has taken in reality.
It's starting to be real and it's very exciting that we're actually starting to take some of the theoretical stuff and actually turn it into frameworks. And those of you who were here for the FDsys briefing yesterday saw John Fore present the first of our diagrams of the real honest to goodness thing and it feels very nice to finally have something really that we can put our hands on. But what I want to talk about today is a little bit about how we got there.

And so as those of you who know me know, I will cast back a long way and talk to you about the first time that I gave a briefing to some people at GPO about some things we were doing in the library program and I used the term metadata and the only response that I got to this use of, to this entire presentation, actually, was from the public printer who said don't use that word, nobody will know what you're talking about.

That was in 1997. And he was essentially right, that nobody really did know what we were talking about specifically and even now that it's a common phrase, I think that we could take
about 12 of you out in the hall and ask you what it
means and play telephone, because it would not come
out at the end of the line what it started at the
beginning. Everybody has a different view.

We've taken a pretty idiosyncratic view
of what our metadata model will be and so that's
our understanding of metadata is based on a lot of
practice in cataloging, in the other activities that
bring you indexing and so on and then it's also
based on all this sort of new learning that we've
been doing.

Fundamentally, however, we've tried to
base this metadata model on a very high level
theoretical picture of what metadata is and what
it's for. Now if we look at very high up, metadata
helps us to locate, interpret and manage data. I
will save you the, from the sort of bromidic
definition of data, about data, about data, about
data.

First and foremost, metadata captures
and records essential information about the
attributes of digital objects, okay. So it writes
things down about other stuff.
We as librarians tend to focus really heavily on the first of these activities, the locate part, and we get real wrapped up in our catalogs and our cataloging and how we get back to things over and over again and that's very, very important.

However, when we started talking about what FDsys would do and how it would do it, we, we became convinced very early on that these other aspects, the interpret and the manage, needed to have a lot of attention given to them.

So, fundamentally metadata is not all that complicated. It tells us how data is formatted or arranged, how, when and by whom it was compiled, where it lives and how it's characterized and named and what nasty nicknames we have for it and things like that.

So, you can see this list falling out into the interpret, manage and locate boxes. It's only when you start trying to really slough it into those boxes that it starts to get complicated.

So we, we made early assumptions based on the fact that every, every great thing that we identified that we wanted FDsys to do in the very
early conceptual talks, writing the concept of
operations document, every time we talked about some
great thing that we wanted the system to do, we
always got around to metadata. And so we learned
really, really fast that this was going to be what
we would call in the trade a metadata intensive
system.

So, we made some assumptions and these
have tested out pretty strongly that every process
that FDsys does will either create or use metadata
or both, so everything we do will either rely on
something that we've already written down about
content or it will generate more information that we
will need to use later.

Following from that that metadata will
be captured from processes going on within the
system, it will be acquired from outside sources
like catalogers, catalogers in libraries, all kinds
of places, or created by us. So we can make it, we
can bring it in or we can sort of kidnap it out of
processes.

That, the metadata in the system,
because it has so many different uses, will build up
in layers and be used for different things at
different times, that it will be centrally stored
within the system and apportioned out to different
places in different functions as it's needed, and
that in order to use it effectively, there is no one
scheme in which to express it, that we would
necessarily, because the system is so busy and so
multi-faceted, that there was not going to be one
great master schema that was going to solve all our
problems.

The, the super format in the sky was not
going to happen, that we needed to be able to have
established formats and even new formats talk to one
another.

So, these assumptions are kind of where
we began with building this model and as I say, as
the model has developed, we've been fortunate that
we seem to have proved most of these out. In order
to talk about how we use what data where, we've
tried to characterize and we've tripped over
ourselves a number of times in trying to come to
these categories and these boxes, but again, we come
back to there are really four or maybe two of these,
these kind of characterizations of metadata, so
descriptive you're used to, I mean descriptive is
like descriptive cataloging.

Technical and structural, I make an
element when I'm in a room full of librarians that
works with librarians, think about collation and
pagination in old-fashioned cataloging, that's sort
of technical, really, structural. It tells you how
the book was put together and in the case of digital
objects, this is where things like relationship,
this is a page in a chapter in a part in a volume in
a series. Those kinds of hierarchical relationships
are structural metadata.

Administrative metadata is things like
who ordered it in the first place. Who, maybe not
in our world all the time, but in lots of words, who
owns it, who owns the rights to it. Who may use it.

That's administrative.

And then there's, if you think of a Venn
diagram of all of these three, the intersection of
all these three is preservation of metadata. All
the things that we need to keep in order to be able
to go back and do preservation processes down the
road.

Now this makes it sound like this is all very, very highly defined and very clear and the edges between these are very furry, there's back and forth and we argue about them all the time.

But, this, this set of four seems to embrace most of the picture and I think before very long, we're going to be sitting down with, in our office with the people on the Harris team and sort of getting a lot more specific about what we mean when we say descriptive structural administrative preservation and maybe we pick more, maybe we cut the list down, but we're going to get much more specific about what we mean.

So, that's a step from the theoretical to the, to the practice.

So, FDsys is fundamentally to be a system for managing content over the long-term and preserving it. It's founded on OAIS and the idea within OAIS that there are these bags, these packages that we put information into in order to be able to move them around and store them properly and as you have become familiar, you know that it has,
that FDsys will have aspects of document preparation and composition, of preservation, of what we start to understand as content management and access.

And so what we've been trying to do in all this model building is balance the needs and requirements for all of these aspects of the system and it's been a real challenge.

So, the planning has told us that this high level view of metadata that it's going to be used all over the place, that it's going to be created all over the place and that we have to make it available across the system very easily and very readily, that seems to be valid, that metadata is absolutely a part of the fabric of the way the system works.

It is not a silo off over there that we go consult, you know, it's not the cabinets with the self list in it that we go visit occasionally, that it's absolutely underneath everything that we're doing in, within the system. And we have made our way around through lots of toting and forging and talking to the idea that we will store metadata in a common form and deploy it out in different forms
as it's needed for the functions.

I'll talk a little bit more about that in a minute.

This is where we move from the 38,000 foot level down to the kitchen. There is, however, in this kitchen no cookbook. There's no one way to do this and so we've been out shopping for ingredients. And so we have some recipes and we're putting together a menu of these choices and this is where we are now.

I think that this list will grow, I think that the menu will get longer as we go along, but these, this is where we're starting. For centrally keeping all this stuff, we are pretty comfortable that we're going to be using XML. XML is kind of where we are with a lot of the functions of this system, and so that that central function of keeping track of metadata will be XML.

That leads us then off to the schema that we need to employ to actually use the stuff. Fundamental packaging, the structure of the packages will be expressed using METS. The metadata encoding and transmission standard developed at the
Library of Congress, it is for document-like objects, although the definition there is quite flexible. And so we feel that for the direction that we're headed and where we are in the immediate term, that METS is probably flexible enough, no guarantees about where we'll be in 10 years, but METS looks like it is the package structure that we can use.

It's, one of its real strengths is that it allows us to recognize and use other schema for different purposes. It isn't everything all on to itself and we don't have to express everything within METS. We can point out by reference to other schema and this seems like in a flexible and extensible system a really useful attribute.

So, the package that you saw yesterday, the picture of -- with the folder of content and the folder of metadata, the package itself will be expressed using METS.

We've taken another step and decided that for expressing the most obvious kinds of descriptive metadata, we have this gigantic, historic investment in mark. I mean we've got this
unbelievably rich collection of mark records that
describe what's in your libraries and so we need --
and mark is not, as we know, an XML-based thing.

   It goes back far before XML was a gleam
in anybody's eye. And so we needed to find a way
that we could make the package at the center talk to
all of that mark cataloging that we have. And the
vehicle that we are intending to use for that is
another development from the Library of Congress,
it's called MODS, the metadata object description
schema and it's a, we will use it as an extension of
METS, that outward pointing activity and it will
enable us to get the bibliographic -- it, MODS is
able to interact with mark and so we will be able to
create MODS records that draw information from mark
records and that gets it then into the big circle of
XML and within METS. So we're all pointing to one
another.

   Now if this sounds complicated, you
should ask John Fore how it all works because he
already knows, our person from Harris Corporation
has got this all figured out. If it sounds
complicated, it is kind of complicated.
But once we got the hang of the METS concept that you can either write stuff down in the METS record like you do in any cataloging record, or you can make a reference within that record and point to another record, once we got that relationship thing clear, new vistas started opening up to us, and so we're very keen on this extension idea.

So, we will continue to create records in mark and there is no way to calculate the value of that asset to us, so obviously we will continue to use it and it is quite central, I will tell you, because it will make you feel good that in all of our planning, it made us feel good when the Harris team came in and assured us that mark records were really central to what we were doing, that we weren't going to just sort of say well that's not a modern technology and we need to find a way to move on.

It's very central to what we're doing.

And finally, I'll throw in a sort of plug for premise, we don't really know what it means that we'll be using premise, but, by golly, we'll be
using premise. Premise is a framework really for expressing all of that information that we need in order to be able to preserve digital objects over time.

It was developed out of an enormous working group that met over the course of about a year and a half for long, long, long meetings on the telephone. And I can attest to how long these meetings were because I was on the working group and they were painful, but the result is this, this very comprehensive data model and data dictionary and there are now starting to be schema which we will be examining over the coming months modifying to meet our needs and using to express our preservation meta data.

Now, this is a little less clear to us how we'll actually, what we'll actually have to do to make that work because we aren't clear yet about what the preservation processes that we're supporting are, so we have to make our best guess about what data to collect and try and figure out how that feeds into actually performing these preservation processes on the objects down the road.
So there's a little bit of guess work there, but I think we're on the right road.

And then of course there are some side dishes. We've used Dublin Corp around GPO for a while, there's Dublin Corp in, attached on to a lot of what's in GPO Access and so we'll not walk away from that. We are using Onix, the book sellers meta data scheme to a certain limited extent and we aren't going to walk away from that. And there's a good deal more coming down the road. I think we will continue to identify needs that we have for schema to express functions, to codify functions and we will start to build a way to evaluate and register those so that we know what we're using and what version we're using and how it works and all that sort of thing.

So, there are, there are a whole set of requirements actually built for registering schema and making sure that we know what we're using and which one we're using of it and how we're using it, where it's being deployed in the system.

So, if you want to imagine a big circle in the middle with all the metadata and then these
sort of spokes going out, that's sort of how it's beginning to take form. The, all the individual spokes will be all these individual schema and they'll get us to functions within the system orbiting around the metadata sitting, and the content sitting in the middle.

So, that has taken you from way up where

the air is thin down to the kitchen in very little time, but I hope it gives you an idea of what this model looks like. It's still a bit squishy around the edges, there's no question about it, but we're feeling pretty confident that we're on the right road and that we are, in fact, describing it in a way that people can understand, which is kind of a breakthrough for us.

So, you can, you can let me know in your questions whether we've succeeded, but that's kind of where we are feeling like we are.

So, if you have questions, I'll be delighted.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill, I'll start out.

Was GPO aware of the mark XML project
that's going on?

MR. BARNUM: Yes, yes.

MR. HEMPHILL: And did they use that in evaluating some of this?

MR. BARNUM: Yeah, I mean all of, yeah, I mean we certainly looked at the whole field and that has almost undoubtedly come into play as we, as we go down the road, right.

MR. HEMPHILL: Okay, is GPO looking to publish these schemas via Web services so that people cannot only access them for both internal and external exchange for pushing and pulling metadata to GPO and to what degree would GPO be contacting publishers to let them know that that schema exists so that if information is being published by either agencies or wherever, that there could be an electronic interchange of metadata?

MR. BARNUM: Sure. At the level that you're speaking of, the big, the package, correct me if I'm wrong, but the level of the big package, the picture that we showed you yesterday, yeah, those will be published because those will be pretty uniquely ours and there, I don't think it's going to
be very long before there is sort of a, an overall registry for these kinds of schema and profiles using OAIS.

So, we will, we will certainly --

(End Track 15 on CD.)

MR. BARNUM: -- publish the information that agencies and publishers and so on need in order to get information to us, both content and metadata in forms that we can use it. That's the whole point of using the OAIS reference model is so that, so that what we need is publishable, so that we can say what we need in order to be able to bring things into the system.

Likewise, for many of these extension schema or for METS, itself, there are sort of global registries where we will register our use of the schema and register our profile; that is, the specifics of our use of it so that we can inter-operate beyond the walls, absolutely.

MR. HEMPHILL: Good, thank you.

MS. STIERHOLZ: I have a quick question for you, actually a couple.
First of all, I was wondering if you had talked to agencies at all about what they're doing and if you can pull it directly from the publication as the agency puts it out or out on the Website, what, however they have it so that, you know, I would assume the agency tries to do it in the manner that best fits their publication, their data.

MR. BARNUM: Sure, yeah, well I mean in talking about all of the different ways in which we acquire and build up metadata, that's, that's a significant one.

If the content comes with metadata that the agency has already built in some form or other, yes, we need to be able to capture that and there again, it's to our advantage to have them know, you know, what will work for us and for us to understand what works for them.

So, yes, we have been talking with the agencies.

MS. STIERHOLZ: So you have talked to agencies, okay.

Because one of the ones I was thinking and there's probably a million others is DDI for
data, but I think there's probably other ones that
agencies are using --

MR. BARNUM: Sure.

MS. STIERHOLZ: -- that better fit their
data.

MR. BARNUM: Right, well I think it, it's a bit like, you know, the software that they
use for composition, there are as many variations on
the theme as there are agencies creating content, so, yeah, what we have to be able to be is flexible
and able to accommodate and make our standards open
enough that their particular applications and so on
can, can inter, inter-operate.

So, yeah, but we are, we're definitely
out there moving around.

Others? Okay. Thank you very much.

(Applause).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: While we are
getting ready for the next speaker, George, could
you perhaps lay out just a little bit of detail what
you're looking for agency to do because I understand
from the future digital system discussion yesterday
that you're looking to actually have metadata
supplied by agencies along with documents that you hope to take into the Federal digital system, but yet a lot of the metadata that you talked about here is going to be things that GPO, itself, generates.

Where is the division between those two sets of metadata?

MR. BARNUM: The division, it is -- there's more than one, there are lots of them, because the divisions are between function.

What I think primarily we'll be getting from the agency -- from the customer agencies creating content and bringing it over to us is the, it the same -- I mean what we use as a starting place anyway is the kind of information that we currently collect, say, on an SF 1. So the kind of information about what the attributes of the publication are in it, in terms of a printed publication, how many pages it has and what size the paper is and so on.

So, I mean that's a foundation and we're already starting to look at what is it that the agency needs to specify to us in order for us to be
able to do all of the different outputs. So look at, as using SF 1 as a model, you know, that's a place to start.

Then I think we have to, have to look much more carefully because I don't think we have existing models to look at descriptive kind of meta data that agencies are preparing and putting with documents as headers or however, however doing it. I think we have to look really carefully at how we bring that in and how we incorporate it.

I don't think that we're going to be asking agencies to do their own cataloging. I mean it, if they want to do it, we need to find a way to bring it in if that works, but again, that's the, the key to using these schema that are, that are standard external to us, that are made standard by somebody other than ours saying this is what we're going to use today.

MR. NAIR: Good morning. My name is Gopi Nair. I am from Defense Technical Information Center.

Let me tell you briefly about DTIC, you know, Defense Technical Information Center, we call
it as DTIC or DTIC. DTIC is the central support activity for scientific research and engineering information for the Department of Defense scientific and information, scientific and technical information program.

We directly report to director of defense (inaudible) under the office of the Secretary of Defense.

You know that DTIC is older than Department of Defense, we actually formed in 1945 in London to collect NASA -- NASA documents. We developed the first online (inaudible) database and we feel that the first Websites, we developed the first Websites in '94.

We have, we invested almost, you know, 72 billion dollars for scientific research last year and we are going about 74, you know, in 2007. And we also have another database called research and summary to find out what is going on within Department of Defense.

And what we do is we provide the technical information to the right people. DTIC
main function's in our center point of access to the scientific and technical information and we also do the second dissemination of SDI and we also provide the balance of scientific communities between the controlled and versus the uncontrolled, that means some classified and limited data. DTIC also manage the information analysis center, which is privately owned entity that support the (inaudible) or DTIC managers. We, DTIC, also host more than 100 Websites and DTIC is the focus point for Secretary of Defense, also relating to SDI.

DTIC funded metadata extraction project with the Old Dominion University, which is in Norfolk. I have some background on metadata. Almost 20 years ago I started my career as a cataloger. I catalog in mark format using library of subject (inaudible) and also I catalogued in CSTI format, most Federal agency uses that one, Committee on Scientific and technical Information for DTIC, in DTIC format using DTIC thesaurus. Also, I catalog for Raycon, NASA in NASA format using NASA thesaurus, so I have some background so almost 20 years ago.
What is automated -- automatic extraction of metadata. It's software that can identify and extract metadata to tell the person whether corporate or the title report number, et cetera, with no human intervention or with minimal human intervention, that's the main goal.

What are the benefits. Citation creation process is costly and time consuming, so this will speed up and speed up, not only speed up the citation creation, but also reduce the operational costs.

NASA joined DTIC on this effort in fiscal year '06. You can read this one, I don't think I have to repeat it. Metadata enhances the value of document collection, you know.

There are people who argue that, you know, you don't need metadata, we can do full text. There is a study going on within DTIC, you know, one of my colleagues, Dr. Randall, and some of you might have answered his questions, they are doing a study, we are doing a study to find out whether do we need metadata or can we satisfy with full text searching.
Old Dominion University, they look at the, evaluate different methods to extract the metadata. One is a machine learning approach, support regular machine in looking at various characteristic of, you know, the metadata, you know, form, size, (inaudible) those kind of characteristic to determine, you know, what type of metadata it is. (Inaudible) use a problematic approach they use looking at the different characteristic of these words.

And the one they selected is the template approach and it's called the rule-based approach. I'll talk about that one more detail.

The machine learning approach, it has to be trained from various samples, it's a very time-consuming process. Performance degrades if you have a heterogeneous collection, you know, and difficult to select the right features for the training.

The benefit of template approach is rule-based, no need for training the samples and you can extract metadata from different documents. Another good advantage of the template-based
approach is that template can be returned by a
non-technical person, not a librarian, but a library
technician can easily write that template.

You don't need a computer programmer to
help you if you have a different set of new type of
documents coming into your collection. That's the
advantage of, you know, a template approach.

It's basically an XML file and you
define the rules how to extract the metadata from
certain group or type of documents. The only
difficulties that, you know, when you develop the
template first, you have to group the document into
classes and define the characteristic of that group
so that when the next group of document comes, it
will automatically select a template.

But they are also developing a new
software, it's just called automatic switching so
that a system will automatically select a group that
categories and select the template.

This is a simple process, you know. You
have the electronic documents that is coming in in
image or in a PDF. We're using an omni page OCR
ingine to convert that one into an XML file and they
uses the audio document layer classifier or the template engine and the metadata will automatically generate it. It's a simple process.

Give an example here, you know, we look at, say, you using the PDF document, using the Omni page, OCR engine, converting to the XML. Then it goes through the metadata extraction software, first it looking at RDP, means report documentation page, can see whether this document has a report documentation page or not.

If the document has a report documentation page, it will go into a sort group. Then the system will automatically select the RDP template and the metadata will be extracted. If it is -- doesn't have an RDP, it will go into an unresolved group. Then at this time we have to do the manual sorting once the suiting software is completed, the system will automatically group them and it will select the correct template.

The one advantage of this system is also you don't need to convert the whole document into XML, you know. You can specify mostly the title page comes within first five pages or, you know,
first ten pages and in our case, a report documentation page, sometimes the RDP comes mostly at the front of the document, but sometimes it will come at the back of the document.

So we can specify to the software, say that OCR, the first 10 pages of the document or OCR the first -- and also OCR the last five pages of the document so that you don't miss if the RDP is there or not.

And also it can run as in a batch process and it can put it all night, so that nobody has to be there.

This is sample report documentation page for the DOD document. You have all the, most of the metadata that you need for a citation creation is already there. This is the metadata generated from the RDP. So you don't have to key in.

This is another title page for a, you know, Air Force process document. This is the layout. You don't have an RDP on this one, you have a title page with a report date, a title and corporate information. The metadata generated like this one.
You may be interested in this one,
sample GPO document without a technical report
documentation page. You will see on the left side
is the GPO document. On the right side is the meta
data generated.

Another sample GPO document, on the left
side is the -- another type of GPO document and you
can see it on the right side is the metadata
generated.

This is example GPO document with a
technical report document page. The advantage of
using -- having this technical report document page,
you have most of the metadata needed to create the
citation creation, it's already there, so if you,
you know, hit on the RDP or here they call it
technical reports page, you have the most data you
needed in order to create the citation.

Benefits of metadata extraction, you
know, first of all, it's we have the citation
creation process, improve the quality because you
have consistency there and also it relieves the
turn-around time, you know, in processing the
document and in our case, most of the subject
analysts, they can focus on, on the, their indexing aspect, (inaudible) instead of, you know, the data entry.

DTIC is in the process of integrating with the, you know, with (inaudible) is one of the DTIC input system of this software. The current status of this one, you know, the development of the software for the RDP has been completed in June and they deliver it to us. DTIC operational staff did an in-house testing for a couple of months and we are satisfied -- you know, you have to remember this is not 100 percent solution for metadata creation, you know. I'm looking at somewhere around 80 percent. If you can meet 80 percent, then you reduce your operational costs that much.

Most, more than 50 percent of the documents that DTIC receive from various DOD agencies have RDP, it's required under, you know, DOD regulation, so by integrating with the report documentation page RDP template, we can say at least 50 percent of them in that regard.

Ongoing development of the software for documents that do not have RDP. They are in the
process of developing that software. They are --
they are supposed to deliver by next year, I think,
by summer. They are also, you know, developing the
suiting software means, you know, you don't have to
group the documents based on the document layers.
The system will group them and develop -- and select
the appropriate templates.

And we are looking at knowledge-based to
improve the quality of metadata output. For
example if, if you have an authority file, if you
can build an authority file for, not for the title,
but person number, report number, report date in a
standard format, even if the person number put in a
different format, the system will extract the meta
data, looking at the knowledge base and put it in
the correct formats. That will save time in
citation creation.

That's all I have to say.

If you have any questions, I'll be glad
to answer.

MR. SWINDELLS: I just, I have a
question, have you looked at the difference in
quality between the RDP and the non-RDP documents?
I know you're developing, say you're developing software for non-RDP, but have you sort of looked at the difference in quality?

MR. NAIR: Difference in quality in terms of extraction depends upon the type of the document. If the quality of the document is very good, you know, the, basically it depends upon the output on the OCR engine, you know, and if the quality of the document, it will be very good and the output of the OCR is very good, then the meta data extracted will be pretty good, you know.

So I think you have 100 percent quality for your document, but if you try to use the older documents in the '70s and '80s, the quality is not going to be there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are there any other questions from council or the audience? So just to follow up, things that are born digital work very well.

Are there any other questions?

MS. STIERHOLZ: So just to follow up, things that are born digital work well really.
MR. NAIR: Yeah, of course.

MS. STIERHOLZ: And those that aren't probably are a --

MR. NAIR: Struggle.

MR. NAIR: Yeah, right, if it is born digital, it's very easy to do it and, you know, we prefer 100 percent perfection, you know, you don't, you don't have to use the OCR engine.

MS. PARKER: Okay, I'm looking at my watch and in order to get our third presentation in, I think we need to save our questions until the end, so I'm sorry, please, let's not miss any of the next presentation.

Laurie.  

MR. NAIR: Thank you.  

(Applause).

MS. PARKER: And while they're getting ready for the third presentation, I want to remind you that in the handouts that you picked up, there are questions that Laurie and her team and all of the people working on metadata and cataloging want you to pay attention to. There will be opportunities online to correspond with Laurie and
the group about what your issues and concerns are if we don't have time to go over these questions today. But they really do want our input into what is going on and what we need as the consumers of all of this information.

MR. WARNICK: While we're waiting for the next presentation to set up, I'll take an opportunity again to pose a question to George and the gentleman from DTIC and that is, are we to understand that the DTIC exercise is being collaborated with, by, by GPO?

MS. HALL: Yeah, well the ODU DTIC is a procurement activity. It's a standard -- it's a statement of work. They have a contract with ODU and we are investigating writing that contract. We've created a statement of work and we've got, it's in the procurement area because we really want to do some testing and do some documents through that process, so that's where it is, yeah. We're -- it's not simply in the investigation stage, we're moving it forward.

MR. WARNICK: Right, thank you.

MR. HEMPHILL: Just one quick question,
is there an intent for GPO only, GPO only to be the
user of this software or is it going to be made
publicly available?

MS. HALL: At this point, it's just GPO.

MR. NAIR: The other thing is, you know, it's all based on the taxpayers' money. It is, even
though it is DTIC, but it is, it's a software that
developing for the agency. I believe that any
agency should be able to use it and DTIC has the
proprietary authority to use it, give it to other
agency.

MR. HEMPHILL: I'm thinking more along
the lines of institutions that may want to extract
metadata from their documents.

MS. HALL: Well, right now the, your,
your, your commitment with ODU is based on, is open
only to SNDI organizations, so those are the
scientific and technical Federal agencies at this
point.

MR. WARNICK: Yes, and speaking for, on
behalf of the Department of Energy, we'd be very,
very interested in following your progress and happy
to take advantage of your successes. Thank you.
MS. DAVIS: We're good to go?

Okay, thank you. I'm here today to talk to you all about the U.S. Congressional serial set, GPO's data entry end user search techniques in the catalog of Government publications.

We decided that we would use the ILS to record serial set information as opposed to printing the separate serial set guides, so we started this new practice.

Oh, well, you get to see the nuts and bolts as well. This is a recent volume in serial set. This is serial set number 14721 and you'll see that we are no longer printing the separate serial set catalog. We're going to check in the volumes individually within this serial set, so this is one of the volumes in case you haven't seen one or it's been awhile since you've taken a look at one.

And this is an individual record of one of the serials, one of the volumes within the serial set. It's the Debt Tax Elimination Act of 2001 and it's one of the individual reports.

This is the cataloging record for this volume -- this individual report and it's from the
14 107th Congress. We just started checking in with
15 the 107th.
16
17 This is the short record view for this volume and it's the serial set number is recorded
18 within the, the 440 field. And you can see it there
19 where it says United States Congressional serial
20 set, serial set number 14721. We're recording the
21 information about the serial set that the report is
22 printed in within the 440 and that's how the
0113
1 information ties back.
2 Then when you run a search in the ILS
3 for the serial set and you enter Y 1.1/2 colon
4 serial, then you get all the hits within this set.
5
6 This is pretty much cookbook.
7 (End Track 16 on CD.)
8 (Beginning Track 17 on CD.)
9
10 MS. DAVIS: I'm much more the concrete
11 side of the operation and you're seeing here where
12 the rubber hits the road. This is the general
13 record for the Congressional serial set and in this
14 record you can go to the item record and see what's
15 been checked in, the volume -- the individual
16 reports within the volumes.
This is a holdings record for the serial set and you would click on the holdings to see what's been checked in so far.

This is the list of the holdings that we've actually checked in, which, which serial set volumes and you see the numbers under the SUDOCs number where it says Y 1.1/2 colon serial number and then the volume number.

This is an individual item record for the serial set volume and we hope to expand this view later, but we're still working on that. It would provide more information if we could get some of the suppressed information for the item record for you, but we haven't got there yet.

This is a standard search for the serial set so that you can look up the individual volumes for the serial set. This is how you would find what volumes have been checked in, what volumes have been received when you're looking to check them in your own catalog. You would run an expert search, WSR equals U.S. Congressional -- sorry, Congressional serial set and the serial set volume number. And if we've sent it, you'll find it. And if you find it,
we've sent it and you should have it.

If not, you know how to get in touch with us.

Oh, my goodness. I have not had enough coffee today.

This is your listing of the reports that are in the serial set volume that are recorded

within the serial set volume and so you get a list of all the individual titles that you got in the little paper unbound pieces. Now you know what, everything that was listed in that serial set volume.

And that's it. It's pretty tied up -- it's very easy to follow along with. It's just much easier to find things, everything is indexed and inter-linked.

Do you all have any questions?

MS. PARKER: Right, council has questions, I believe, for you.

MS. MILLER: Yeah, I have one. This is Ann Miller from Duke and I'm kind of intimate with ex-leapers in so many ways and one of the things I've discovered recently in moving my serial set to
off site is that you can only have 500 items per bibliographic record.

So you're making a separate bib record for every serial set volume; is that correct, and then when you check it in, is that what you're doing?

MS. DAVIS: No.

MS. MILLER: Or you're checking it in on a main, the U.S. Congressional serial set record?

MS. DAVIS: Right, and then we're adding the 440 to the individual report record.

MS. MILLER: Okay, at some point you're going to run into trouble because your holding records will be too large because as you check things in, you're adding an item, item, item, and it can only have 500 items on a bib record and I'm just warning you, this is going to happen.

And there is an answer to it, you can do what's called up and down-linking through short bib records and I will be happy to share that with Laurie. But you're going, what will happen is you will be able to continue to add items to that bib record, but the catalog, the OPAC part will only
display the first 500. So if it's the 501st record
or item that you've checked in, it will not appear.

So, there are a couple, the up,
down-linking with short bib records is a
possibility, that's what we've done to connect them

as we moved some, I don't know, 7,000 items to off
site and it all had to have it on one bib record.

Well, it's a system setting in 18 but
not in 16. In 16 it's a set limit, we've been told.

(Woman not speaking in microphone).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, I'd love to
hear about it, because I talked to my systems people
and they said they couldn't change it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have (not
speaking in mic).

We're, I'm sorry, we're on 16.2 at
University of Maryland. We do not have that
limitation, we have been able to change the setting.

MS. MILLER: Okay, I'd love to hear
about it, because I talked to my systems people and
they said they couldn't change it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Not speaking in
microphone), because we're a consortium.
MS. MILLER: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 16 libraries,
we've got close to 4,000 items.

MS. MILLER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Plus (not
saying in mic), like Time magazine and some of our
regionals, so you can imagine the --

MS. MILLER: Okay, I want to know how to
do it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll tell our IT
people.

MS. HALL: Yeah, get with Linda Resler
if you have time or just E-mail me and we'll get it
to her to make -- because this will be our next
stage of planning.

MS. MILLER: Yeah, okay, that's great
news but, maybe.

Otherwise, I think this is wonderful.

I, you know, I like to be able to go in and sort of,
because we're binding our serial set as we go and it
will be nice for us to be able to look at it sort of
on our schedule rather than GPO's schedule.

And one question I did, another question
I have since I've got the microphone is how do we know when a volume is finished, is there an indication in the record? You've sort of said, okay, these are all the reports in 14271, there will be no more added.

MS. DAVIS: We get the complete bound volume, so when we start checking them in, we check in everything that's in that volume. That's it, that's the end.

MS. MILLER: Well, but how did I know?

MS. DAVIS: Did I understand your question?

MS. MILLER: How did I know it's the end?

MS. DAVIS: If I did it, it's the end.

(Laughter).

MS. MILLER: Well, I don't know what you've done.

MS. DAVIS: Trust.

MS. MILLER: I don't know when you've finished doing it, you know, unless we have a mind meld thing. Do you see what I'm saying?

MS. DAVIS: Well the mind meld is we
would do it all on the same day, so we would have
the bound volume. So when we start checking them
in, we check them all in on the same day and so when
you see them in the OPAC, that's it, that's
everything.

MS. MILLER: So, you don't check them in
until the bound volume's complete?

MS. DAVIS: Right, that's all she wrote.

MS. MILLER: That, that, thank you, that
will do.

MRS. RUSSELL: Let me point out for
everyone here that you do have a copy of the
handout, but there was a notice posted on FDLPL on
the 17th, there was an electronic version of this
online and the re-production in this is
unfortunately not very clear in the handout, but you
can see the more detailed records in the online
copy, so you may want to look at that when you get
home, particularly if you're going to be sending
comments in.

(Not speaking in mic).

MS. PARKER: Barbie, I don't think it's
on. Barbie, can you get it?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear.

You all started this June; is that right?

MS. DAVIS: We started this in June.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Not speaking in mic). Are we supposed to get (inaudible) records from utilities. My understanding is that the (inaudible) updated records that (inaudible) in those updated records, so I guess the telling us about it because there are those libraries that don't have (inaudible) serial set number (inaudible) have, again, have (inaudible). Get all the information, so (inaudible).

MS. DAVIS: Right.

MR. MCKINNEY: Rick McKinney.

MS. PARKER: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

Right, we're going to ask if everybody will come use the mic at the end of this table so that everybody can hear the questions and the comments, thank you very much.

MR. MCKINNEY: Rick McKinney, Federal Reserve Board Law Library.
The service that catalog in hard copy is no longer being published; that's correct?

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. MCKINNEY: Now the last one we have, and I checked with others, is the 104th Congress. Do you have now things beyond the 105th, the 106th, 107th catalog in the way that you talked about?

MS. HALL: We're editing the 105th. The 105th will be the last serial set catalog, so we have one more to go and then that will be it. Then we will move totally over to what the ILS, there's a, did somebody say something, I'm sorry. Then we'll move over to the functionality with the ILS.

MR. MCKINNEY: Now, will this catalog then be part of GPO Access? Or, or it has to be through --

MS. DAVIS: It has to be accessible through the ILS.

MR. MCKINNEY: Through the ILS.

MS. HALL: And we have a logical, there's a logical base, if you go to one of the
operational forums, or is Linda's session going on right now, there is a logical base for the Congressional serial set and from that you can, you can, you know, retrieve volumes just with that serial set number.

It also links to the preliminary schedules and other components and that draft paper or the paper that's up on the desktop has all of the indexes that used to be in the paper that we had and we've indexed for those same fields in the ILS.

So there's a comparison there so you know we're not losing any functionality from the paper to the online serial set.

So, I don't know if you've even seen that paper or not. I don't know if we even had copies, but we can get you a copy of that.

So Linda's session is at 1:30 p.m., so if you want to see that logical base and the demonstration of the serial set piece, you can see that at 1:30 p.m.

MS. DAVIS: Does, I'm sorry, just to clarify, when we say the ILS, we mean the CGP, the Catalog of Government Publications.

MR. MCKINNEY: Okay. Now is the catalog
as well as the documents going to be preserved for perpetuity as GPO has said about the documents so that you can have access to the collection?

MS. DAVIS: That is certainly the plan.

MR. MCKINNEY: That's the plan, all right. Thank you.

MS. PARKER: Are there any more questions from the audience, if so, we'll ask you to please come up and use this mic so everyone can hear.

Thank you. I know it's a pain, but it works.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. In the draft that was distributed prior to the conference, it looked to me like there was a record for an individual report or document where the call number had been Z'd out and the call number for the serial set volume had been written in and I shot you a brief comment saying, oh, that's bad.

But just to confirm, is that going to be done?

MS. DAVIS: No.
MS. SMITH: Okay, good.

MS. DAVIS: I got that question from you and I was very disturbed by that. I've been meaning to E-mail you back and I haven't had a chance with the conference activities.

No, we have no plans to do that. That would be wrong.

MS. PARKER: We love your candor.

Thank you.

Are there more audience questions?

Are there any more questions from Ann or anybody else on Council? Ann's our most knowledgeable cataloging person.

MS. MILLER: That is a very scary statement.

MS. PARKER: We agree, but there you go.

MS. MILLER: Just wait for basketball season, Marian.

MS. PARKER: You can have my tickets.

Okay.

Laurie, do you want some closing remarks?

MS. HALL: No, I just wanted to remind
everybody about these two other important things that we're dealing with right now. We really need your input, my E-mail is on the back, the cooperative cataloging, you know, we talked cooperative cataloging for so long, we really are wanting to move forward on that, so we'll be giving you some more information shortly and then we had a bunch of questions here that we need, you know, people to confer on and to discuss and give us feedback about some baseline metadata requirements.

You saw the metadata extraction. You know we have thousands of harvested, potential harvested things coming in. We can't do lovely full level mark for every single one of those, so we want to get your, you know, input on what would be a base level of metadata that's acceptable to everyone.

We probably will be putting out something in the next couple of weeks as a draft for you to comment, but we need, I've already gotten some comments from somebody and he wrote me down his baseline, so we'll be putting that out shortly.

We want comments back from the community so we can probably, you know, looking forward to ALA
mid-Winter to maybe to finalize one.

Just also from the cataloging, we're also looking at the content access level discussion, we're involved in that, too, so, and then we have, if there's any other metadata schemas we need to look at, George has covered most of them, I don't think there's -- is there any more left? I think we're, you know, there's -- oh, plenty.

So if there's anything else we need to be investigating, you know, we're looking at a lot of different things, so we always like for somebody to say oh, what about, have you heard about this project, so let us know.

And then historically we've had this list of cataloging priorities, which things go first and they're the Congressional, but did you see that lovely record that came from this metadata extraction for Congressional publications, it really looks good.

So, because Congressionals are published a certain way, it's really easy for the extractor to grab that information. So we need to re-assess our cataloging priorities, they're available on the
National Bibliography Web page in, I think they are in the cataloging guidelines, aren't they, Jennifer, is the priorities -- yeah, they are on that NAB bib page in the cataloging guidelines our priority, so we're going to be looking at that. Again, we would like your suggestions or comments on that, too.

MS. MILLER: I have one question, surprise. Have, have you -- this is Ann, again. I'm sure the court reporter can't see me.

In terms of pre '76 cataloging, in, have you thought about the fact that a bunch of us are sending a lot of our older material and some of our newer material to off-site storage and for those of us who are using the Harvard model, you know, storage system, we have to have cataloging records?

And I'm wondering if it would be useful to explore that kind of partnership where, you know, we've made minimal level cataloging or loaded minimal level cataloging from wherever for these things that we have and I mean I'd be happy to try and report out some of that for you.

MS. HALL: Right, we, yesterday at a quickie lunch, Cindy, Mark Sandler and I got
together with Jennifer and we were looking at what we called them briefly as three mini little projects. They're kind of based on this.

We've heard that discussion that everybody needs to move their stuff to off-site storage, we need to do some inventory stuff as well. We're looking at three little scenarios. We want to catalog some of the stuff from our shelf list, we're working on a contract to do some of that. But sometimes we need to go out to validate that, we don't have enough information, so we're looking for some, one method, a partner to, so our cataloger can call your cataloger and say go to the shelf and pick this piece off the shelf and validate what I have. Is there any other information that I have?

So we're looking at that one approach.

Then we're looking at the approach of taking, you know, opening our Z 39 gate to go into some libraries and grabbing some based on some minimal level, and so that's one of the things we, what's that minimal level that we will be able to take in and not compromise the catalog's integrity. And I forgot the other one.
Jennifer, do you remember what the other three -- Cindy, do you remember what the three were? I wrote them down yesterday.

(Woman not speaking in mic)

Right, right. Right. We're looking kind of like a registry kind of function, we're, we don't need to spend our limited dollars on cataloging stuff that's already been done, so we want to find out, find pieces that nobody's done before and then we will do that.

So there's three little thing tests that we want to do in the next, you know, three or four months.

MS. PARKER: Yeah, this is a huge opportunity for us to be the partners with GPO in getting all of this information documented for the use of all of us. So, I encourage all of you to let them know what we're doing and what, what we can help with and then also what we would like to have them do as Laurie said for the priorities, because this is our opportunity to give our input as well to these projects that are currently moving forward.

And please, I mean Laurie said it, I've
said it, the feedback is needed and it's, it really is a great opportunity to make access real. Are there any other council questions or comments? Or any additional comments or questions from the audience? That doesn't work. If you'll come up here to the front, please. Oh, it does, oh, well. MS. ABBOTT-HODUSKY: Bernadine Abbott-Hodusky. I just want to know how this metadata is going to work with serials, if there are changes in titles and the history of a serial and the series, things like that, monographs I think will be great, but what about the serials, if anybody would care to answer that.

MS. DAVIS: If you're talking about the Congressional serial set, we plan on checking in the individual serial volumes.

MRS. RUSSELL: No, she's talking about serials, in general.

MS. DAVIS: All serials.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah,

periodicals.

MS. ABBOTT-HODUSKY: I'm talking about
all serials, I mean even the --

MS. DAVIS: Oh, the metadata

extraction.

MS. ABBOTT-HODUSKY: Even scientific reports come out in series or as serials.

MR. NAIR: We haven't tested anything on the serials because, you know, basically DTIC has only the technical reports and so we use the software to do that one. But I believe we can use the software, you know, to test the serial section, too.

MS. PARKER: We'd like to thank you, Laurie, and all of the presenters and all of you all for joining us for this most important session and update and thank you so very much.

(Off the record for lunch 12:00 p.m.)
MR. SUDDUTH: Okay, welcome back from lunch and I hope you enjoyed being able to get out. I certainly enjoyed getting out even though it was a little cooler than the last time I was outside the building, but it felt nice. Yes.

Okay, we have mics that work. Something for Geoff and Susan to look forward to.

Our next session is access assessment and marketing and this will be moderated by Geoffrey.
Swindells and Susan Tulis and I will let Geoff start.

MR. SWINDELLS: There we go.

In the front of the room for those of you who haven't noticed, you should have a handout, two-sided handout. One side says access assessment questions for council, the other side says marketing questions for Council.

Okay. What I'm going to do, I have the access assessment portion. I'm going to say some very brief introductory words, but that I'm going to run through each question, there are five of them, and then I'm going to open up responses to the room and Council at the same time. Oohh, and so that you'll have to fight.

And when you come to the microphone, I'd like you to tell us which question you are addressing, as well as your name and your institution.

Okay. Before I go to access assessment question one, I actually like the title, access assessment. It has the word assessment in it, yes, but I like the word access and that's what I want
to, I'll focus on before assessment.

And that's both physical access to our collections, physical means and tools to obtain information from an inkless report of a few years ago and intellectual access, the abilities necessary to obtain that information, understand it and put it to use.

And I think that as we move forward into a service-oriented program, I mean we've always been a service-oriented program, but really stress our service responsibilities, assessing how we're doing in both physical and intellectual access and for physical access, I mean, would mean equity of access, to bring up Ann's point earlier and Sandra's point.

And for intellectual access, it's also very important to know that the assistance is there to help people understand, use information.

Title 44, Section 1909 which I'm sure you've all memorized, I actually had to look up the exact wording, although it's pretty much the same as in the instructions, requires that the superintendent of documents shall make firsthand investigation of
conditions for which need is indicated.

And the, the last regime we had for making this requirement real was a system of mandatory self-studies and then on-site inspections were necessary.

So I'm going to play Sheila Garr and I'm going to ask for calisthenics and the first calisthenics is how many people remember Shiela McGarr. Oh, that's a lot, okay.

How many people in this room filled out a self-study? How many people in this room have no clue what a self-study is? Okay.

The self-study process was I think a great conception, having a self, an instrument and then using that instrument to determine where help was needed. It was a great idea, but the instrument itself was burdensome on both depository librarians and on GPO staff. So the question is how do we move forward and find other ways to assess how we're doing.

So let me read the questions one by one and we'll come back and I'll open it up for questions.
Question one, given -- start again.

Given limited resources, what are some of the effective ways of ascertaining conditions in our partner depository libraries given Title 44 requirements. Possible options include but are certainly not limited to the use of the biennial survey, modified self-studies, et cetera.

Question two, how may GPO best identify, share and promote depository management best practices to depository library staff and library administration?

Question three, how may GPO assess public access at depository libraries in an accurate and responsive manner? Public access includes bibliographic, physical building, Internet and on-site computer access.

Question four, how may GPO best provide depository management and educational assistance given limited resources to maximize the benefit to all depository libraries?

And question five, how may GPO better assist regional depository libraries as they provide assistance to their selective depositories?
And I'll add a note on the last, given that Tim Byrne is on council, how do we best assess regional libraries?

Since Tim did devise an instrument and I never really, I don't remember what happened with that instrument, but an instrument to do that kind of thing.

So now I'd like to open it up to the floor, both council and audience and again, at the microphone tell us which of these questions you're addressing, I'll page through, put it up on the screen and identify your name and institution.

Thank you.

MRS. RUSSELL: Geoff, can I make one comment before we begin on this.

This is an information-gathering process that we wanted you all to talk to us and to council with the idea of planning for a more-detailed discussion. So this is a beginning of a process, not an end of a process and we didn't feel that we knew enough to start out with a white paper or a briefing topic and, you know, kind of force the dialogue.
We wanted this to be a pretty free-form discussion so that we could then have sort of a baseline with which to really begin developing some ideas, so please be very open with us and we would value your input.

MS. WEIBLE: I'm Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library.

I think what I'm going to suggest has an impact on all of these questions, but I guess I'll pick one, number two.

What are depository best -- or depository management best practices? Are they written anywhere?

I mean I think it comes down to we expect -- we talk about we want good service at depositories, but we don't define what that is and I mean we have ways of defining it in terms of, you know, equipment or whatever, but I think we need to look at it more from a service perspective rather than a bean counting, how much computers you have and that kind of thing.

So I think that that's something that GPO can do, is help us develop some standards
that --

(End Track 17 on CD.)

(Beginning Track 18 on CD.)

MS. WEIBLE: -- help us develop some standards that then libraries can measure themselves against. I mean it goes back to the self-study concept except that it's given us some real, you know, practices that we want to achieve.

Because, and then there are also standards that don't fit, that aren't one size fit all because as we've heard over and over again, not all depository libraries are the same and that we need to develop standards that can be adaptable to the circumstances in a given library.

So I think that's a really good place to start and I think it's really doable, too.

MR. SWINDELLS: Arlene, do you think the best practices should come from GPO or from the community?

MS. WEIBLE: Well, I think that's one of those collaborative kinds of things that probably should happen, I think that both, both of those groups have something to give on that particular
MR. SWINDELLS: Okay, thank you.

MS. STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina. I don't, I can't address a question because I have a question for you, for GPO, really.

Have you, do you get complaints about libraries and their access and if so, without naming names, you know, what kind of complaints are you getting? Sort of where do you see the need?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO.

We do get complaints and they're pretty across the board from I can't get into the library because I'm not an ex-student to the library closes at 5 and I can't get there before the end of work, so therefore I can't get any material.

Then there's also the complaints that come not from the, the parties trying to gain access to the materials, but from the librarians themselves saying we're instituting sign-on software for authentication of users, everybody has to have a card, how does that impact.

And so in the past we've kind of had a
unit dedicated to, to reacting and to being somewhat
proactive in the development of policies related to
this. And so we're trying to find a way to be more,
more responsive and be proactive again and deal with
a new reality, which prior to 9/11 meant anybody
could get in anywhere, in theory, and now we know
that reality is unless you have two forms of ID,
you're not getting into public buildings, Federal
buildings.

So, trying to find, you know, what is
the -- what's a good mechanism of re-instituting a
response -- a more responsible or responsive way to
deal with some of these issues and to fulfill our
Title 44 requirements.

MR. SWINDELLS: Did you have a
follow-up, Katrina?

MS. STIERHOLZ: No, I --

MR. SUDDUTH: Okay, Dan.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of
New Mexico.

With respect to number two, I have to
wonder, I mean I think Arlene is on to a good point,
excuse me, in that I don't think it's just
necessarily up to GPO to develop best practices, I'm sure they have some, but I also think that there are a lot of people out in the depository community that are doing a lot of good things to promote their depository and manage their depository, so I think it's probably, there's got to be some data-mining mechanisms that either GPO has or some other people have that just, are you going to just make, perhaps make a call for how do you market for a depository, what do you do to draw people in from the local community.

How do you attract people into your library when the hours are open because Rob, and our complaint is well libraries are not open in 3 in the morning when I want to study.

You know, I'm sure there's more than one other academic institution that's heard that complaint as well. So I think there's a lot of different means, it's a matter of developing good communication mechanisms which are already in place in most cases, so I think you need to try and exploit that a little bit more.

You know, we've had a couple marketing
22 seminars this afternoon -- during -- at this
0145
1 conference and whatnot, both, by those, by private
2 vendors as well as by the depository communities, so
3 I think kind of got the foundation there.
4                Regarding number three, I think you need
5 to add at the end of that last sentence staffing,
6 administrative willingness to continue in the
7 program and other types of questions that we are
8 starting, that we continue to get. I mean when I
9 was chair, we listened to these same issues that
10 we're dealing with right now and it's not getting,
11 it's not lessening any.
12                I mean I'm in a situation right now
13 where I don't know what my status might be in six
14 months, I don't know given a new dean coming in
15 where we're going to be, what kind of support I may
16 or may not have, things like that.
17                So I think you really do need to look
18 at, I've lost a lot of our staff over the last
19 18 months. It's hard to be a regional of one. You
20 might be able to be an Army of one, but you can't be
21 a regional of one.
22                The last one I would also, how does GPO
assess regional depository librarians, I think you've gotten feedback on this. There's no great surprises out here, folks. Some regionals do a really good job. Some regionals don't. You know who they are. You know, let's not, let's not try to gussy up the windows any more than they are. You want to know more, go ask some selectives. I bet if you ask a couple of my selectives, they may say I'm doing a good job or they may say Dan who. I think, again, there's, there's feedback mechanisms in place. You get informal feedback at these conferences, you get informal feedback by a variety of places that Judy has attended, other council members have attended, ALA, things like that, PLA, you know who's doing a good job, you know who's not. Now, you need to look behind the curtains, why are they doing a good job or why are they not doing a good job and look at those particular reasons. In some cases it's staffing, in some cases it's administrative support. In some cases they've -- they're wearing too many hats. In
some cases they just would prefer to do other things besides be a regional librarian, but they're stuck in that role.

So, again I think it's, let's look at the root causes again in some of these, thank you.

MR. SUDDUTH: Thanks, Dan.

Ann.

MS. MILLER: One thing that strikes me and I'm going to I think look at number, I think it's question number one because -- well we talked a lot about this when we went to the modified self-studies or the self-study process.

If you're someone in, say, Dan's position or a place that's facing some issues in a variety of ways, there's nothing better than having a bunch of Government bureaucrats come in and tromp around and look at the administrator in the eye and say, you know, you can't treat our depository like this because you just can't.

And I think the plan had been with the self-studies that, you know, there would be a way of, you know, short of semaphoring SOS, there would be a way for the depository to say, well, I really
need to be, I need to have an on-site inspection. And I think there, there really is no replacement for that in some circumstances.

It, it really can make a difference to have someone on the ground.

A question or a thought that I had, but it puts, puts a, somewhat of a burden on the community, but I think it might be working, possibly work is to use depository library consultants from within the depository library community to come in and talk.

And I know that that's a role for the regionals, but I'm not sure that the regionals need to bear all of that. I think that there are a lot of very good selective depositories who often can provide advice and council in a unique way to, and can assess conditions and maybe make suggestions from their own area -- point of view.

But I'm wondering if there's any way that we can get back to sometimes having the foot tromping on the ground, you've got a, you know, the evil Robin Haun-Mohamed coming, shape up.

MR. SUDDUTH: Yes.
Hi, I'm Esther Crawford from Rice University in Houston and I guess this is partly a response to number one and partly to number three.

Drawing on the Patent and Trademark depository library program, again, one thing that they did for their libraries is they provided us with a customer survey tool and it was a paper tool and there were only, you know, 85 of us, so it's a little different with FDLP, but I would think this is something that could be automated, would help give a feeling for what was happening with a particular depository, but it might also give the program helpful feedback on what we should be doing, where we should be going, so.

Could you tell us a little bit more about how the tool perhaps differed from the self-studies tools that we had?

It was, it was filled out by customers rather than the depositories.

Oh, okay, I see, okay.

Just getting, just getting that information and getting the people that
we served to say how we're doing I think would be very valuable.

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay, that's good.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders from the Library of Michigan, mine is I guess sort of one, well it's kind of all over the board.

Any assessment that's done has to have a positive component to it. Universally for some reason that I never really quite understood, people perceived on-site inspections to be a negative thing.

First of all, the inspectors only see a, if inspectors only see the bad libraries, how are they going to know the good ones? And secondly, having your Government bureaucrat come in and say what a fine job you're doing is equally powerful. So there has to be some positive aspect.

I've seen GPO inspectors very graciously put somebody on probation and do it very nicely, you know, it's possible to do. It's just it's hard and it's, it's time-consuming and it's costly.

My other aspect to this is that assessment not only has to be positive, but
assessment has to have teeth. I have watched depository staff look the superintendent in the eye and say we don't care and they've pretty much gotten away with that. And that so there, there, it really does to have a little bit more teeth. I understand that you don't want to drive people away in droves, but it's got to have more teeth than it's had.

MS. SINCLAIR: Hi, I'm Gwen Sinclair from the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

I'd like to first address question number four about how GPO can provide educational assistance.

I lead hikes for Sierra Club. Sierra Club made a video called how to lead a hike, so maybe GPO could put together a video called how to run a depository library. You know, obviously you cannot get into the minute details that are included in the depository library manual, but you can hit the highlights. And the main advantage of having a video is that you can use visuals to illustrate the things like putting the depository symbol on the door, what does a shelf list look like, what does it look like when you mark your pieces with property
marks. What does it look like when you have a
public access computer. You know, what does it look
like when you give good service to patrons. So
that's, you know, an idea of how to handle that at a
relatively low cost.

I'd also like to talk for just a moment
about number one. We had a GPO inspector come out
to our region a few, it was one of the last
inspections that took place before the inspectors
were re-assigned to other duties and we found that
to be an extremely positive experience. Even though
I think some of our selectives were very
apprehensive about having an inspector visit, a
couple of them were on probation and the purpose of
the visit was to get them off of probation, but I
think almost all of them came away saying that
having the, a person from GPO come there and have
some means of interfacing with the GPO is a very
positive experience. They were able to ask
questions.

Most of my selectives have no ability to
come to these conferences, so if there's no visit
from anybody and they can't get visited by me
because I don't have any money to visit them, then
GPO is the only possibility they have of actually
being able to sit down with somebody and ask them
questions about procedures and how they're set up.

Thank you.

MR. SWINDELLS: I'm going to do a quick
calisthenics here.

How many people in this room have been
inspected, actually had the physical presence of an
inspector?

Would you want to be inspected again,
how many of those same people?

MS. PARKER: Geoff, ask if everybody who
has been inspected actually met the inspector.

MR. SWINDELLS: You just did.

Okay. Let's go to Barbie. Barbie.

MS. SELBY: No, I'm good.

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. HOLVOET: Okay, I've got, this is
Kate Holvoet from the University of Utah.

I have like four different thoughts as I
listen to people that keep cropping up.

One, going back to the first issue on
assessing. All the assessment in the world doesn't help if there aren't any consequences, good or bad from the assessment. When you have a lethargic, non-responsive regional that has always been that way, us communicating to you that this regional is not working and not doing large swaths of their responsibility doesn't seem to result in anything. And so after a while you just write it off and go, okay, we've got a regional who's, you know, doesn't answer an E-mail.

And so it gets frustrating when you feel like we're operating like we're the regional when we're not and we don't have the same resources and we don't have the same access, so, that's just one piece.

Addressing number four, the best way to provide depository management and educational assistance, the thing that I see, and I don't know how, how this is happening in other places, but I think it's pretty common is that stand-alone documents departments are going away, which means you're going to have one person, possibly a subject selector who's ultimately going to be responsible
for keeping track of are we maintaining our
Title 44.

Almost more than that, I'm worried about the loss of just straight subject expertise as it kind of gets lost in the shuffle and it's an administrative thing and it no longer becomes sort of the high, the high level of assistance.

And so in all of the educational programs that we do here, I think I heard about the OPAL system and putting things online. I'm really looking forward to that as a way for people who don't have the funds to travel to have those introductions to documents librarianship and access to all that training expertise, because, you know, even in my department we have four librarians, only three of them ever come at some point to DLC and not always every year.

And so that sort of refreshing and staying up on top of things can be really difficult in the absence of a clear place to locate all of that.

Even if what GPO was doing was giving a list of if you need census training, contact these
people in this region, that would be tremendously helpful because in the meantime, we have to sort of try to remember to go to the State data center and go to all these other places, so even a path-finder on training opportunities would be tremendously useful. And I totally forgot my third point, so I'll stop.

MR. SWINDELLS: You can always come back when you remember.

Barbie.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

It occurs to me we're the regional for Virginia and I do try to get out to, you know, some libraries every once in a while and one thing that would be helpful for me, I don't, I mean I don't want to be an inspector, but having a checklist of just, you know, things to ask or things to notice. A success story, our State library never had the seal on their front door. It is now sandblasted on the font door of the library of Virginia and it's beautiful. It's not red, white
and blue, but it's this very tasteful gray and it's
the depository symbol. Yeah, and they've got it on
every door, there's a bunch of doors, anyway.

But some kind of checklist would be
helpful for me.

MS. GOLDSWORTHY: Janet Goldsworthy,
Gary Public Library, Gary, Indiana.

I started as a Government documents
librarian about three years ago with the
understanding that I would have at least half of my
day off of the reference desk to work on the
Government documents collection.

I started with the ten best things,
first things for a new Government documents list and
one of the things I realized pretty quickly is I
needed to do a self-assessment. I approached my
department manager and said I think I might be able
to get this done in maybe three to four months.

Well, we lost three full-time librarians
and since then I am on the reference desk 7 and a
half hours to 10 hours a day, managing our
Government documents collection.

One of the things that I would suggest
is I do manage to get the deadlines done, so I get my biennial survey gets done, my item selection is very carefully assessed and gone over.

One thing that could be done is divide up this self-study into maybe four sections and say this year everybody is going to do the first, I don't remember, it's been a long time since I've looked at it, so I've been chipping away at my self-assessment and for everything I find, there's one more thing that I need to fix. And I'm working on it, but as is, I don't know when I'm ever going to get a self-assessment done.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County Main Library.

I'm a bit concerned from what I'm seeing and from what I'm hearing. This is my second conference here. There is to a degree a myopia among the FDLP with regards to academic institutions and I have talked, I personally have never been inspected, but a few people on our staff have been. And they universally say that when the inspector came last time, the earth moved. Everything stopped, everybody dropped everything they were
doing and got involved in preparing for this inspection.

And while the inspections may be very good at maintaining a certain amount of standards, it is an odd fact, but the librarians that I've talked to that have been through inspections at academic institutions oftentimes use the inspection as leverage against their own administration.

When the administrator says I want to cut this amount of space, this amount of staff, this amount of money, it is oftentimes saying, well, you know, Mr. Administrator, you can't do that because the accrediting body over here that you're also beholding to says we need to have access to X amount of material and so on. Public libraries don't usually work that way and right about now, if we had some GPO person coming down and saying you naughty boy, you haven't done your self-inspection in 18 months and you haven't done a policy review and so on, he's going to get thrown out on his ear.

This time last year I was creating a policy statement, a justification of why we should remain a Federal depository library and it was a
very near thing. In the intervening year we have
been told that we will have to reduce our collection
and our space because we will be looking at fusion
of all reference services within the main library.

We're looking at building and expanding
agency services, a young adult section. The only
people that we're beholding to is our county
administrators and our taxpayers and if you want to
get on Sun Sentinel, there was a near taxpayer
revolt about three weeks ago, okay.

Make sure that whatever assessment model
you're using may have teeth, but the teeth better
not come back and bite you because a lot of
libraries that are teetering on the edge may just
say this is not worth it and you'll lose a lot of
good public libraries in particular.

MS. MILLER: I have a question. This is
Ann Miller, I'd like to have a question, sir.

If we were to try, if we were to try and
formulate a good assessment that would work well in
public libraries, do you have this suggestions of
what that might include and in, you know, how, it's
true a lot of us are academic, we don't have to talk
to a Board of trustees, although we are beholding to
people who give us money.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Right, it's very
strange and I'd actually been giving this quite a
bit of thought actually over the last couple of days
because what I'm finding is that in public
libraries, at least the emphasis is not so much even
on providing information anymore, but services that
actually go beyond information.

There's a big emphasis, though, on the
public library as a community place, and we've been
talking a lot about Government information as it's
now separate from print, as it has an intangible
quality to its own, many library directors, I'm not
100 percent sure about ours in particular, but
certainly in public institutions, the public
libraries are looking at beyond not just books and
brick and mortar, but into other intangible
services.

And so the very concept of a public
library is changing very, very quickly and I think
that the, the idea of the public library as brick
and mortar education center for the common man has
got to go along with the idea of paper documents from GPO.

I don't quite know how to get all this in and this would have to be discussed in much more detail later, but, and I don't want to say public libraries need to be held to a different standard than academic libraries do, but they are certainly operating under some very different realities these days.

MR. SWINDELLS: Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

MS. HOLVOET: Kate Holvoet, University of Utah.

I remembered my third point just after I sat down.

The inspection program has had its history and its good and its bad parts, but something that puzzles me about what GPO doesn't do is why don't you guys follow any other publisher, vendor model.

You know, we have people, vendors come in to talk to us about their products, whether we're purchasing them or not. Lexis Nexis, a lot of
people, that's a non-judgmental contact that still
gives you a tremendous amount of feedback about how
people are using your products, what people want
from you and, you know, if you sent, if you had, you
know, five basically vendor reps for GPO that
visited public -- not public, visited depository
libraries, you know, and you sent them out to the
western region and they were covering and, you know,
once a year they were coming through and making
contact with all the selectives, you know, are you
getting what you need, what kind of training
opportunities are you looking for.

I mean I really think that that would
tremendously help communication and it would also
help us to have a GPO representative there who can
go oh, by the way, here's a nifty thing that we're
doing, here's a resource you can use at the point of
need versus the self-assessment. There's always the
issue of you don't know what you don't know.

And sometimes having somebody there when
it's not a, oh, my goodness, if we got it wrong,
we're going to go on probation issue, but somebody
who's actually more seen as a person who's informing
us about your services and partnering with us in that way. I really think that that would be a tremendous boom, particularly to smaller libraries. I mean as a big academic library, we have the money to send people places, but a lot of regional, a lot of smaller libraries in the area just really can't do that.

MS. VASSILAKOS: Jill Vassilakos Long, California State University, San Bernardino.

Just my luck I was standing behind her and she said very close to what I was going to say, but I thought I'd go forward anyway.

We actually haven't been inspected but we've had a site visit and one thing that was remarkable about it was that the person who came in was able to tell us there's an easier way to do this, or this is what some other librarian, libraries are doing, you might look at it.

One thing about depository librarianship is that oftentimes you're the only depository librarian in your building and you're not really getting a good chance to meet together with a large group and talk about different possibilities and
someone who's seen, maybe not seen it all, but seen
a lot and comes into your library and can say, oh,
well someone else had that problem and they did
this, that's really very helpful.

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

Go ahead, if you want, council.

MR. SUDDUTH: No, go ahead.

MR. HAYES: A couple of different
points. First, I hate the first three words, given
limited resources. No one has sufficient resources,
so get rid of it.

But the process one thought was we just
went through a North Central accreditation, all
right, we did self-assessment. There is a
consequence. With the poor public librarian or
public library who can't meet their needs, yadda,
yadda, yadda, well then my, and again, I'm getting
into the assessment part, my assumption is until
proven otherwise, then you are really not meeting
the need that you decided to become a depository
librarian and your loss to the program will not be
that critical.
If you don't have the resources to accomplish what needs to be accomplished, so the accreditation process, skipping back and forth here, we just went through at Notre Dame is away from the measures we are used to having.

Did you have the eagle on the door, could all of your people get at the computer, the log in, the printing, into what was meant to be accomplished. Are you meeting the assessed needs of your user population, your students. You have these teaching objectives, are you meeting it, if you are not meeting it.

When I mentioned assessment earlier on, I was not thinking, and you have identified one assessment, access assessment, but there are multiples that you then go what is the objective you're trying to meet for which we are assessing you and how can we help you meet that accomplishment.

Again, going back to the North Central Association, they don't send out the accreditors, okay, so that using Indiana as a, an example.

We have some people in Indiana who are very long in the tooth at being active in delivering
information and meeting what I think is the
expectation for a depository, regional or otherwise,
to meet the needs of our constituents, given
sufficient guidelines in terms of this is what we
expect you to assess, this is the outcomes we are
looking for. How you meet those outcomes is up to
you, but then there is a choice of X depository
librarians in the State of Indiana who then meeting
the given limited resources could drive to
X depository, do an inspection given the guidelines,
write the report anonymously, so that, oh, that
Steve Hayes, I can go back and beat him up or tell
his depository, his director, you graded us wrong,
yadda, yadda, yadda. Could give what some teeth
because you're being --
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MR. HAYES: -- you have a, the blessing
of GPO saying we've given them guidelines, there are
expectations and their final report truly reflects
what we expect to be assessed. You're not meeting
it. Perhaps it will begin to give those teeth back
that Robin could then go or used to go to the
director of libraries and go, you know, Steve is not
doing the shelf list. Government documents not
linking on the list of locations within there. He
didn't put the eagle up. Well now, instead, you
have a collective group that again over Robin's or
Judy's name that says this is the report that came
back.

You obviously have some issues here that
need to be done and addressed because we are going
to send a team back again to follow-up and meet some
expectations. But you need to move beyond access.
There are other assessment areas that need to be
done, too.

Thanks for asking, Geoff.

MS. PARKER: Excuse me, Marian Parker, and, Geoff, I want to add in here on question number
four for the intellectual access I guess is the
portion that I want to get at. When we talk about
the educational opportunities that GPO can provide
for all of us to be better at documents, I take that
to include being better at using the various agency
publications and Websites, et cetera.

And what I would love to see GPO do is
partner with or strong-arm the agencies or, you
know, provide candy or something to, and you know,
and get documents librarians to volunteer to help
out, too, but to have each of the agencies create
some sort of online lesson to enable us to get
better by being able to self-educate with prepared
materials.

In the legal community, again, my only
frame of reference here, there's the center for
computer assisted legal instruction and for 20 some
years we've had people out in law schools creating
lessons where we can go to them to learn about
evidence or we can go to them to learn about
Attorney General information. We can go to them to
learn about how to use a reporter service.

I mean there, it can be broken down into
a smaller component or it can be blown up to as
large a component. But I see and I hear people
saying, well, I just want use anything from, you
know, this agency, or whenever that question comes
in once a year, you know, for using census
information or something, I need some help. And I
just think if we could develop a group of these kinds of instructions or people, you know, we'll just never get enough people out on the road to go teach all of us everything we need to know.

But I'd love for that to be adopted as a project to help all of us.

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis.

I'm going to make an overgeneralization and that is that in principle, the role of every public library in this country is to provide equal and open access to information. So the extent to which that library has access to the online digital materials available through GPO, every public library in the country is at some level a passive selective depository. That's my overgeneralization. And it's true of academic institutions as well, but I'm focusing on public libraries because of the governance structure that's unique to them and their funding sources.

Having said that and recognizing again an overgeneralization, but for the most part the mission of every public library is to provide equal and open access to information to the residents of
their community, the taxpayers in their community. They take on an obligation to be selective depositories, even passively.

So when one argues that they cannot defend supporting that collection, electronic or print as a selective depository, I begin to question how well the administration in that library and the Board of trustees in that community fully understand the role of Federal information in the lives of your residents.

So, the extent to which, and this becomes -- how one assesses this gets back to the user interview, which again is very expensive to do, but it does mean getting to the user.

The question I guess for council and for GPO is who initiates that dialogue? Is it the responsibility of the selective or the regional to do that, to understand their community, or is there a role that GPO can play sort of as an impartial participant in this that gets the library out of the political fray of asking these questions to self-protect, but does, in fact, give GPO information that they could use to improve the
program and help libraries that are in this situation where they're fighting for space and fighting for money to better position themselves and make the argument to maintain the collection.

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay, we're going to have to move on to the next session. If we have time left, though, I encourage you to come to the mic again, or to submit comment cards or grab one of us in the hallway.

Thank you.

MS. TULIS: I'm sure your assessment question can somehow relate to marketing so you can come back up.

I want to begin a little bit by giving sort of a historical perspective on what has been done in terms of marketing from GPO's side, but before I even begin with that, our discussions this morning about training I felt were very, almost so similar to marketing. It's like just insert the word marketing is where we were talking about training.

You know, Ann talked about spending an hour a day learning about a database. I think you
could do the same thing with marketing in trying to market your, your particular depository program.

And I also want to make sure I'm, we're all clear, same, starting from the same point of view. When I'm talking about marketing, it is not just to our users, it's also to our administrators, it's to our regionals, and it's to our Congressmen, as well.

When I was asked to talk about marketing for the program, what Judy and I talked about was sort of just starting from the premise of what is it that you can do at the local level to market your program, which obviously is going to vary from library to library.

In order to do this marketing, what is it that you would like GPO to be able to do to help you in order to do that sort of marketing.

In the past, and I know there are many of you out there because you're as old as I am and will remember that in the 1980s there were a number of PSAs that were created by GPO, both for radio and for TV. Over the years we have seen posters, brochures, bookmark, decals, stickers.
In about 2001 to 2003 there was sort of a renewed promotional effort, some of that was to take into account the fact that we were now doing things electronically and not strictly paper-based. I'm sure you will all remember the make the connection at a Federal depository library which then inserted a computer into all of the promotional materials.

The other thing, you know, that's been done and was the interactive map to locate depository libraries. There's the order form on the Website for promotional materials and in I think it was 2003 there was a CD Rom that was sent out to all depositories which had promotional material in there that you could use for your particular library.

And let's not forget promoting depository anniversaries, we have one coming up, by the way.

I do want to do just like Geoff did, some aerobics.

How many of you meet at least once a year with your directors to talk about the depository program? If not meeting with them, do
you do some kind of, for those of you who didn't raise your hand, do you do any kind of annual report which sort of highlights your activities? That's good.

How many of you know the name of your Congressional staff member? Okay.

How many of you have contacted that staff member in the last year? Okay.

With that in mind, I want to go through the questions. Okay, and here's where I'm not good with technology.

Okay, I, too, would like to read through the questions and then allow time for discussion.

And I have seven questions. What is the most desirable marketing method for the FDLP, printed literature, interactive marketing via rich media, radio, TV ads? What should the focus be on marketing efforts? Demonstrated expertise in locating content, electronic access to content via cataloging records or unstructured search, access to tangible content?

Would it be helpful to utilize display booths at State-wide events or library conferences?
What products or services should be highlighted in such a booth or display? What are some innovative ways to create a marketing network of subject matter experts to more effectively implement knowledge sharing? Would it be helpful to send little news blurbs and press releases to the major library and information science Government technology journals, magazines more often highlighting the benefits of the program and technologies to support the user community? GPO's sent them in the past, but I know, as GPO knows, they have not been used, so is it really worth the effort for them to do that, do these blurbs? Would it be helpful to develop a marketing program specifically to educate Congressional staff about the program? And as I, I highlighted a little bit of what was done during the 2001, 2003 promotional campaign, is it time to update what was in that and are there other ideas that we could move forward with? And I will open it up for discussion. Larry?
MR. MEYER: Larry Meyer, I'm the Director of the San Bernardino County Law Library, so in answer to your previous question, I do talk to my director every day, usually every minute.

For question one, might I suggest that all of the above and anything else you can think of would be appropriate. It seems that especially in this modern day and age we need to use everything at our disposal or whatever we want to promote and we need to promote it many different ways, many different times.

So it just makes sense that GPO with its vast network as well as its own promotion department should be focusing more on those efforts of promoting the program. And tying that to number five, I would suggest that, again, we're being a little bit myopic in the promotion and that in reality there should be constant promotion going to local media and there is no reason why, for example, something shouldn't go to the San Bernardino Sun and include the fact that Jill and I are, have the two depository libraries in the City of San Bernardino as it is appropriate. Same thing can be done all
over the country.

MS. TULIS: But is that GPO's responsibility to send that out or your responsibility?

MR. MEYER: If GPO wants to prepare something and send it out, we've had this discussion before with the radio and TV spots, all we need to do is have them and, you know, if we need to distribute them locally, fine, but again, in today's day and age I cannot believe GPO does not have a listing of every media, both TV, radio, and newspaper, every single media outlet in this country. If not, I know some local public libraries they can go to and look at the books that have them listed.

MS. TULIS: Thank you.

Amy.

MS. WEST: Amy West, University of Minnesota.

There were two things. One relates to the media issue. This happened to us accidentally, but it would have been nice if it had happened on purpose, which was we had an elections page from
2004 that I had been thinking, boy, we should really update that and just about the time I walked out to the reference desk to talk to the person who had originally done it, our communications director came down and said, hey, NPR wants to talk about this, do we have a page.

So, it, I think it would be wonderful if GPO could say, you know what, X and so current event is happening right now, we would like to send out some blurbs to some of the major media around the country in two weeks. So, these are the things that we would like to talk about, you guys, here's a heads up in case somebody wants to contact you about it. Then you have some time to prepare and it doesn't necessarily require that people actually, you know, prepare an entire page or that there's any particular script, but it allows for a certain amount of customization.

Because one thing that was the case with this NPR interview which I ended up being the one to do was our communications people said okay, we want you to talk about this and so knowing that, I mean I have to, you know, do what they want but I also
wanted to make sure that I gave certain other information that's just specific to the Government. So there gives a little flexibility. The second thing is that we are a land grant institution as I'm sure plenty of other people are here, which means everybody who is a land grant is having their 100 anniversary next year, in addition to probably others. We are already planning because it coincides with our collections symposium to focus on Government information for our symposium next Spring, but if there's going to be a lot of people going through this anyway, it would be great to have a set-up display section that covers the, you know some of the historical issues, maybe some of the more fun documents out there, et cetera, that could be used by all of the institutions that are going through their Centennial.

The last piece is that in the last year, since we've had this communications director, there's been a strong move to create a consistent, single brand for University libraries Web-based materials and I thought that the following would be really trivial until I tried to do it and found out
it wasn't so much, which was I said, hey, we probably should stick the FDLP logo on our University libraries home page. It's on the door. Julie Wallace actually was the one that said, you know, we're not doing this, we should do this. There was a very long conversation to get that on there.

MS. TULIS: I'm sure there was.

MS. WEST: Partly because the color schemes don't match. Now, we ended up going with a non-standard version of the logo, we made up our own that's gray and white. It would be super if any content that was produced that was marketable could either be in a format that might work well with an institution's own marketing structure or could be. And I realize you guys don't want to do that because you also want to market yourself, but something that is amenable to existing branding structures of the institution at the other end. So, flexible branding, notice on media things and big, pretty display for the 100th anniversary.

MS. TULIS: Thank you, Amy. I'm not
sure if it's Jill or Bernadine, you guys --

MS. ABBOTT-HODUSKY:  Bernadine Abbott-Hodusky.

You wanted to get to the library press, which would include the American Library Association and the law librarians of SLA, ALA be here in D.C. next Summer and SLA is here and so are the law librarians already.

I would suggest that you have a special luncheon with the editors and whoever on the journal and not just American libraries, but the division journals, public libraries, so on, and invite them for a special tour of the Government Printing Office and a luncheon and nothing gets to their hearts faster than through their stomachs, so.

And just to introduce them because there's a new editor of library journal, there's a new assistant editor of the American libraries and there are other new people, so I think that would be good.

The other thing is that I think that you ought to market the program to the journalism schools where they're creating future newspaper
people of the world and I don't really think that's ever been done, so.

MS. TULIS: Thank you.

Jill?

Thank you, Bernadine.

Jill?


I was thinking of another constituency that you could market to, as if you don't have enough to do, but it was public libraries. I was thinking about what people said in the last session and I thought it's great to have training materials, for instance, this is stat USA, look at the site, this is what it does, but it's better to have this is how you answer this question, like someone comes up to the reference desk and asks, I'm writing a business plan, how do I figure out the demographics of my area and you show them tools. And if you could do that on the Web, I know our public library has weekly training sessions and the guy that runs them is always going nuts looking for content. If
you had three questions up on the Web, he'd use them in a heartbeat.

MS. TULIS: Thank you.

MR. SHUMAKER: Earl Shumaker, Northern Illinois University.

In regards to number one, I most certainly agree that all of these would be very beneficial. The thing is that a lot of us do, a lot of -- a lot of us do a lot of marketing locally, but, for example, like myself, there are certain things I don't, I'm not expert at such at graphics and we could use the help of GPO.

For example, in my own community I work with a lot of service clubs, like AARP, not-for-profit organizations, the Women League of Voters and I'm always looking for ideas on, you know, on what, how we can advertise the depository program.

Also, on number three, you mentioned the display booths, exhibits. This summer I gave three presentations, I'm our libraries representative to our library system in Northern Illinois and part of that system we have 400 libraries, and that, those
libraries, it includes all types of libraries, so as I said, I gave some workshops this summer throughout that area, that geographic area. But of course there was a lot of people that could not come to those workshops.

So I talked to the executive director of the system and I said what about the possibility of having traveling exhibits and I talked to our regional depository library about this, also, and everybody is very positive about this.

But this, again, this is something that I need additional help on and I think in this case, you know, with GPO, if they had the expert, experts there to help, give me some ideas, help me with graphics, that sort of thing. Just, you know, it's a collaboration of a lot of different organizations and, but, yes, working together, I think there's just so much that we can do in regards to publicizing the depository program.

MS. PARKER: Thank you.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County Main Library.

One of the things that I think we need
to look at is not just marketing from the standpoint of we, meaning GPO, FDLP, putting information out to our users, but looking at marketing as a part of the communication cycle that allows also the feedback to come back in.

Because we were discussing earlier about, earlier in the day about training, deploying expertise and so on. When the public or our users become more aware of the program and especially if we do emphasize things like the expertise of the staff, when they come back in to us and say I need help on this or that topic or to use these tools, you will know very quickly whether you're an expert in this area or not.

And I've actually had this happen to me personally, I then became an expert, so to speak, in some of these areas of our collection, developed training modules and then took those back out through our regional consortium to very great and positive responses.

So I think that when there was this discussion earlier today about what do we need training on, how do we get trained and who trains
us, let the public tell you what it is you need training on. Because to this person you're an expert, to this one you're not. You will find out very quickly.

So marketing as part of an ongoing cycle I think would be part of the vision document as well. It could be very beneficial.

MS. PARKER: Thank you.

MR. SEXTON: Steve Sexton, Georgia Southern University.

And this, my comments concerns I guess maybe question number one, but more so than one of the earlier comments about the use of the depository logo on library home pages.

And I did complete or conduct a survey of at the time I think all of the depository libraries in the country over the span of February to September or October of 2005 and I would suggest that more libraries need to do more to promote online access such as using the logo. And I actually did this regarding three specific questions.

Is the use of the logo, was the logo
used by the library's home page, was there a prominent link to Federal depository library program or other Federal Government information resources and, well, and number three, was there some sort of obvious statement by that depository library to the affect that they are telling the public that they are a depository library and stating what that function is.

The public, you know, general in my opinion, much of the public does not even know what the depository library symbol means, so even if you tell, or they don't know what a depository library is. So if you tell them that we're a depository -- excuse me, we're a depository library, that most, a lot of the people are not aware of what that is.

So, I don't have my statistics memorized, but I think less than 5 percent of depository libraries did use the logo on their library home page. I don't have the percentage, but somewhere on the order of a little over 400 out of 1,290 depository libraries did provide some sort of link to resources, online resources. And the third question, I think it was less than 400, 300 or so,
I'd have to check my statistics, had some sort of statement to the effect that they are a depository library and provide this function to the public.

So I was a bit disappointed, I mean not to indict all of the depository libraries, but I was a bit disappointed in the numbers that I found that do this in an online manner and so it's not an earth-shaking conclusion, but one of my conclusions was that depository libraries should do much more in an online manner.

So that's my suggestion.

MS. PARKER: Thank you.

Sandy.

MS. MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. I'd like to suggest that maybe GPO take Denise's comments about all public libraries can now be a virtual by de facto depository library. Try to market that to more public libraries. I realize they may not to able to be official depositories, but it should be a way to begin to heighten their awareness of what they can do without being one and if the mission is to get this information out, whether they are a depository
or not, I think that would be a useful exercise.

MS. PARKER: Thank you. Go ahead.

MS. BARBER: Marcia Barber, Hollins University.

With regard to number one in desirable marketing methods, go online. You're basically trying to market an information services network, right, we're all part of this big information services network. Well we know there's a Google, but does Google know there's an FDLP. There are other services that are online that are information-oriented. How many people here use the DocuTicker or Resource Shelf Websites or get that newsletter. That takes advertising. Advertise this program through those outlets. Go online to other areas of information services of people concerned about search, people concerned about data and advertise, market to them and advertise through them, as well. That's the community that should know much more about this program and they don't.

MS. PARKER: Thank you.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.
Follow up on what Sandy and Maranka said and the vision document, I mean there's lots and lots of this stuff in one of the earlier iterations of that vision document, the sort of next step things, the Google ads, the, and I'll put my Linda Saferite hat on, also the Gov For You program that would have, would go towards public libraries in general and other libraries in general. So there's wonderful things in some earlier iterations of that vision document.

MS. PARKER: Esther.

MS. CRAWFORD: Esther Crawford, Rice University.

And this kind of follows up on what's just been said, but to take it a step further, I'd like to see GPO work with other agencies to get referral links to us. It would be nice if somebody that was using Thomas or using the census page had a very obvious way or a place to link to find out where they could go to get assistance with those tools, where they could go to get more information.

Again, and I'm sorry for, I keep referring to the Patent and Trademark program, I do
that to them in reverse, too, but I get a lot more referrals from people using different resources on their pages and they link to us all over the place.

It would be nice if GPO used its contact with agencies to have referral spots for us at the information points where the users already are, because as much as I love the glossy brochures and the pretty posters and I do use those and I don't want that to stop, it's the people that haven't already found me that I need to be marketed to, so, thanks.

MS. TULIS: Thank you, Esther.

Steve.

MR. HAYES: Hi, Susan. I'm Steve Hayes, I'm the business services librarian at the University of Notre Dame, I'm no longer documents. Marketing solves a problem, delivers a message, identifies the needs and meets that need. What you've got in question one is the answer is yes. The question --
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(Beginning Track 20 on CD.)
MR. HAYES: The question you've got ahead of that is, okay, which audience are you going to meet, what is the message you wish to deliver.

One of the people have already spoken I think and we need to go to our audience to find out what it is and our audience here is, and I think you're doing it with the depository librarians, but also the end user, they don't know what the suppository librarian system is, you know, so depending on what it is that you want, something that is common to all of us.

I think if you ask some of us, I don't want any marketing because I'm up to my ass in students now, I do not want more of them. However, each segment has a message to deliver. Just this, the name recognition of there is a Federal depository library program to me strikes a national level and GPO I think has that obligation, or it could have that obligation or have that role in that they are a national level down to the other extreme, which is some of us put out or need in an internal Website that a nice, short news article that you had later on, all I have to do is copy and paste the
appropriate ones into my audience in the college of 
business or college of arts and letters, et cetera, 
meets my need of I want something fast, I want 
something easy. I don't want to do much work on it, 
yet I'm delivering message out there. 

So I think some of your answers that you 
get is more in terms of what messages do we want to 
deliver. 

One that you asked that I'll, that would 
be not GPO's to have is that information to a 
Congressman. I think that they may take that as not 
education but perhaps something elsewhere as the 
community here may want to go and devise that 
elsewhere, then the role would go to a GODORT, or an 
ALA or ARL, et cetera. 

So, but good questions, but we still 
have to know what's the big question we're trying to 
do, is it just to get us until they know it's not 
the suppository collection or what? 

MS. TULIS: Thank you, Steve.

Go ahead.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, 

California State library.
The obscurity of the Federal depository program was brought home in a very personal way to me when my neighbor across the street moved in a year ago. And I went over to talk to him and I told him that I work for a Federal depository library and this man is, is very active in local politics, he's, he's a real estate agent, he's not an uninformed individual and his response to me was how does it feel to handle that much money every day?

So I, I think that we face the problem of obscurity not only with members of the public but also with other librarians, because I've talked to other librarians at conferences and they don't know what this program is, either.

We can, we can sit here and think that we know how to market this program to the various audiences that we're trying to reach, but unless we're marketing experts, we're just guessing at what might work.

I think, I think that it might be appropriate, especially in this age when marketing is such a finely-tuned activity to hire a marketing consultant before embarking on a marketing program.
to, to try to identify what techniques would work,

to identify first of all, as Steve said, who is, who

is, who are the audience, who are we trying to

market to. And what are the problems in getting the

message out that we perceive and what are the best
tactics to use to get that message out.

MS. TULIS: Thank you. Susan, Ann,
different Ann.

MS. MILLER: That plays well to what I
wanted to say, because my first thought as I'm
looking at these things, you know, printed
literature, interactive marketing, radio, TV ads, I
started thinking I get a blog from the FDLP and I
manage, I only look at a few blogs, but I manage
them on blog lines and it's the very last one I ever
look at because it's boring. I mean I -- it's not,
I don't think it's meant to be real exciting and I
do actually look at it, but so far what I've seen is
not, it doesn't have a hook. It doesn't have a

pizazz, it doesn't have, it's boring.

And we're, you know, I think a good
marketing consultant, a hip marketing company might
be able to bring us a little more up market, which
is I think what we need and want. We need to know
who we're marketing it to, but I think we just are
not, not, not doing it in a very creative manner.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.
I have just a question, isn't there a
Government agency called the ad council that
specializes in that kind of thing promoting
Government programs?

MRS. RUSSELL: We're all thinking over
here.

MR. HEMPHILL: I see their ads on
television all the time.

MRS. RUSSELL: I think the ad council is
a group of, brought together out of the advertising
industry and they do coordinate PSAs and that kind
of thing, but they're not, I don't believe that
they're Government.

MR. HEMPHILL: They do, I know they do a
lot of Government public service ads. I don't know
if that's a funded organization by the Government or
what, but could they possibly, could GPO investigate
discussing it with them?

MS. TULIS: Short answer, yes.
Ann.


I can't count the number of minutes wasted in the last 22 years discussing with a library director about the sticker on the door, okay. Do we have to have the sticker, can we have the words and not the sticker, can we have the, the eagle and not the words, does it have to be red, white and blue, do I have to put it right side up. I mean, you know, I've even had a library director argue with me that he didn't have an exterior door, you know, so.

We, we tend to kind of get bogged down in the small stuff, but my point is is that I think we have as much or more of a problem within our own profession as we do with potential audiences outside of our profession and the simplest and one of the most effective things we ever did was go through the entire State library and everything that had a Federal imprint, whether it was a depository copy or not, got a spine label with the little eagle that says Federal publication.
And patrons brought them to desks and asked people, staff to explain it and the staff all freaked and thought we were going to take them all away. So, it was a real simple thing, but that it opened.

MS. TULIS: Branding.

MS. SANDERS: Yeah, it was branding, pure and simple. So maybe starting smaller is not necessarily a bad concept here.

MS. TULIS: Thank you.

Dan.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico.

You know, when you're surveying the audience earlier about working with Congressional staff and everything, obviously it's a good idea to always educate Congressional staff, but why stop there, why don't we continue to educate the agencies who produce the information because I'd sure like to see more from the EPA online rather than hearing about their libraries closing.

Talking to directors, I just have one question for Larry, when you talk to your director,
does your director talk back to you?

(Laughter)

And if he does, then it's, it's time for the home, Larry.

You know, in, I agree that I've heard some very interesting and good comments and as I'm sure council has and I would agree with Larry that all seven questions that you ask are good ones and we've gotten some good answers.

When you work with Congressional staff, I had the opportunity a while back to work with a Congressional archivist who after about a 30-minute conversation it dawned on her that she was working with Government information, from a Senator's office.

So, there's another kind of a hook to grab. Somehow, Ann, a hip and slick sexy commercial with LL Cool J and U2, I don't know, man, I'm, I think you're on to something there.

MS. MILLER: Would you watch it?

MR. BARKLEY: You know what, it would be a hook, I would.

MS. MILLER: Yeah, I just, I keep
thinking back to those, the Pueblo ads from a few years ago and you remember those and you watch those and you go yeah, I can go to the, I can get this stuff free from the Government. Well that's what we need.

MR. BARKLEY: I agree. The other thing I was thinking of that, given our little trash can fire we had a few weeks ago, we did a lot of work with the campus news media and they really are good people who are knowledgeable not only in dealing with the media, but in receiving media announcements and publicizing them campus-wide, so that's another venue that I would certainly look into.

MS. TULIS: Yes, and most campus newspapers are usually looking for.

MR. BARKLEY: Well it's not so much campus newspapers, because I don't know how many people get through our campus newspaper after they get through the ads for the wanted dancer ads and things like that, so, but I think the campus news media, people who deal with the announcement of who's having breakfast with the University President, things like that is a very good source of
information both for input and output.

MS. TULIS: Thank you, Dan.

Sir.

MR. WILLIAMS: Hi, I'm Dave Williams, I'm with Bernan. I'm not a librarian, so maybe I'm not allowed to make a suggestion.

MS. TULIS: No.

MR. WILLIAMS: But I love marketing, I've been a publisher, book distributor, marketer for over 30 years and marketing has always fascinated me I guess no matter what side you're on because there's certain axioms you tend to develop over a period of time. And one of them that's touched on here, I believe this lady over here mentioned something about listening to what end users ask for. I just came from the other session on development of collections and some other gentleman mentioned something about the local associates in an area and that kind of thing.

And one of the marketing axioms that I've always adhered to is a focus, and quite often less is more. And as a quick example of that in the mid-80s, a publisher I was with, we were putting out
a CD Rom on special education and there were five
programs in there that were very specific to special
education and four programs that were general
calendar, time-keeping kinds of things that first
were popular when CD ROMS came out, and working with
the author of that product for special education and
I said I'd really like to take out the four programs
on general time-keeping and that kind of stuff and
he said well why, he said they're very useful.
And I said, well, they probably are, and
he said but I have plenty of room on the disk. And
I said, well, you certainly do, but I said as
marketing the product, if I market that and it says
there's nine things here and my end user sees it and
says yeah, but I'm really only interested in the
five on special education, they're not necessarily
going to want to get it because it doesn't focus on
their needs.
On the other hand, if the other four
never appear, you're most likely to get the reaction
of, look, I can use every single thing on that CD,
this is great.
And we did that, and to be honest, I
can't remember whether it sold or not. It could have not sold for another reason, but it's sort of an axiom in marketing that private publishers and marketers and distributors follow. And I sometimes wonder if there's an opportunity when you're dealing with such a wealth of information to provide a market focus around whether things like social security, Medicare Part D, somebody mentioned real estate, whatever it is, the value of the collected material you have in a given area and develop a relationship with local, local groups in that area and develop very tailored messages, develop very tailored descriptive pieces on those kind of products and services and take a very focused approach.

And that's always part of a marketing mix. I mean obviously you need a very broadcast kind of approach, but a true marketing mix in my experience involves both the very general broad branding of something in conjunction with a very tight specific focus on specific end user groups as we were talking about.

So for what that's worth, two cents, and
maybe taking a focused approach.

MS. TULIS: Thank you.

Arlene?

MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible, from the Oregon State Library, and formerly of the University of North Texas where we got a tremendous amount of publicity when material was withdrawn from our collection, so.

And I, I think that my point is that, you know, seizing upon events that are of interest beyond a library but, you know, what's going on in our world socially and politically is really important and the other thing I was thinking about is I can't remember which big investigative report it was, the Star report or something, those were, those are opportunities when there's something in the news and, yeah, look, we've got something associated that we need to push that out really quickly.

I think it might have been the Star report or one of the other ones where we actually got a press release from, I think it was GPO about it, but we got it in our boxes three weeks later,
you know. You know it just doesn't, it just doesn't
work like that. I mean if you've got something
that's really hot and now, you need to address it
hot and now and if we can get some help with getting
that information out to us quickly, I think that's a
really good thing to think about.

And then another thing I wanted to
mention was in puzzling about how to work with
public libraries and the program. I would really
love to see if there's a way we can think about
marketing the depository program as a way that
public libraries can address the needs of
E Government services that are being provided in
public libraries. We need to kind of get those two
things together in peoples' mind.

What is it about the program that can
help support those types of services that public
libraries are now being asked to support. And I
think, you know, the fact that it helps libraries
get good, you know, Internet access and good
computer terminals is one thing, but what are, what
are the things that we are really truly providing to
librarians to help them understand E Government
services and help the public use them. I mean we need to be serious about training and, you know, maybe the training is helping people figure out how to use the FEMA site so they can help people fill out their FEMA claims, you know, I mean it's that kind of thing.

It's very specific rather than, you know, worrying too much about how to process a box, but how to look at what services people are, again, it's taking it back to what did, what are people coming in and asking for and really trying to look at how our program can support those specific needs and do it now and not six months from now.

MS. TULIS: Thank you. Okay, you each have 30 seconds.

MR. BYRNE: Susan, can I just say something real quick? Susan?

MS. TULIS: Who's talking?

MR. BYRNE: Me.

MS. PARKER: Tim's talking.

MS. TULIS: Okay, go ahead.

MR. BYRNE: I just wanted to brag in that following up on what Arlene has said about the
things being removed from the program, I had my
picture in the Menichi Daily in Tokyo holding two
pieces of the USGS CD Rom.

MS. TULIS: Cool.
Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a fast
thought, is there some way when GPO puts mark
records out, when you go into Google or Amazon, the
time of the book comes up?

Is there a way that the symbol could
come up if it's an electronic only document?

Just a thought.

Also, we put SUDOC numbers on books,
paper materials, if we start putting the symbol on,
every time we put a SUDOC number on a material, if
it's also in the catalog, if it pops up somehow,
that might be a way to have recognition of
Government document.

MS. TULIS: Good idea.

Ann.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Ann). Really
fast.

There's another model besides the Patent
and Trademark Office, the Census Bureau State Data Center Program actually embargoes data and if you're part of that, if you're an affiliate, you get the data before the general public does. There's an obvious way in which documents that are being released in E only format could go to depository libraries and, oh, look, you also have an incentive to be a depository library because you're going to get it first. You're going to have access to the actual information before it's released to the public.

It's a model that's out there and potentially useful.

MS. TULIS: Thank you, if you have other questions, comments, ideas, please feel free to either talk to any of us or write them on the card. Thank you for your attention.

(Applause)

(Short break taken).
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MR. SUDDUTH: I know we've made it to
the last morning and apparently people are slowly gathering, but we do want to get started in about five minutes.

There are handouts on the stage, but I'll give everybody five minutes and then we'll get going.

There are handouts for this session on the stage. Okay. Okay, let's go ahead and get started with this morning's session and one last mention, there are handouts for this.

This morning's session is going to be led by Geoff Swindells from the University of Missouri and he's going to go down on the floor here. He's actually, I came over and asked him a couple minutes, it looked like he had a choir set up over here and then asked him who was singing tenor in this group and he said, no, it's more like a Greek choir, which then --

MR. SWINDELLS: Chorus.

MR. SUDDUTH: Chorus, sorry, which invited the question is this a comedy or a tragedy.

And I'll let him answer that. But some goal to actions, a regional/selective dialogue and I'll let
Geoff take it away from here.

MR. SWINDELLS: Thanks, Bill.

Okay. My name's Geoff Swindells from the University of Missouri and you might call this one of the first steps in translating the vision document into action statements.

The vision statement outlines -- whoops, let's get it back. There we go. The vision statement outlines a number of goals for the FDLP in the 21st Century, and our challenge is to make them into effective, concrete actions that really work to the benefit of the residents of the United States. And we're going to sort of begin the process today.

My regional colleagues and I, the Greek chorus, will be, although they don't usually have speaking -- they usually don't speak at once in a Greek chorus, so we're not really going to do that, and they of course convey the moral of the story, or whatever.

But, each of my regional colleagues will read one statement out of a total of six and they are somewhat provocative statements, although people keep telling me they're not. So at the very least,
they are unadorned and unqualified and announced
statements. They are going to give a little bit of
context behind the statement and then after each one
is read, we'd like to take 10 or 15 minutes to, for
both council and the other attendees to discuss
these.

And what I mean by discussion is we'd
like to get a sense of do these action items make
sense. Do you agree with them? Do you disagree
with them? Do we need to qualify them in some way
to make them realizable, to make them work? Do we
need support from someone to carry them out and who
is that someone, is it GPO, is that the regionals,
is it cooperative work amongst ourselves.

So, let me go to the first of these and
I will sit down.

MS. MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch from the
University of Kentucky and I have the pleasure of
going first with a provocative statement.

Regional libraries should provide users
with digital copies of materials that have not yet
been digitized on demand and at minimal cost.
The context of this statement is that
our feeling was that perhaps digital copies had become the equivalent of what we used to do or still do in providing our users with fiche-to-fiche copies or paper copies at no cost and in most cases at minimal cost and so have we now moved far enough into the digital era that this is a one-to-one correlation?

Comments? Council?

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill. I have one comment. Digital copies as opposed to point them to the area where they can locate them online so that you don't have version issues, things being out of date?

MS. MCANINCH: There is one qualification in this statement, not yet been digitized, so we're only talking about things that are not already out there.

MS. STIERHOLZ: What about those things they have access to in paper?

MS. MCANINCH: I'm sorry?

MS. STIERHOLZ: Does this include things that they have access to in paper?

MS. MCANINCH: Yeah.
MS. PARKER: So what you're saying is you would in this statement, you would expect the regional to digitize anything that any user in the region might ask for?

MS. MCANINCH: If they prefer the digital copy. Kind of like I want my fiche copy or I want my paper copy.

MS. PARKER: Right, and in saying that this might -- that this could be a goal, are you anticipating support from GPO to provide equipment that would be standardized or better than what your organization might be able to afford?

MS. MCANINCH: We aren't anticipating anything. We are just throwing this statement out for -- to be made about how this might need to happen, what kind of support might need to be provided, you know. Is this even anything anyone thinks is going to be an expectation from our users or our selectives.

MR. SUDDUTH: Well, this is Bill Sudduth, it's going to, it's going to depend on the, what's being requested to be done because at my institution, if it's a journal article, if it's a
chapter in a book and a library alone does it and delivers it electronically, but they don't do over 50 pages.

I mean something like that, so if somebody came to me and said they wanted this Congressional record digitized from the, you know, from X time, it would, my question back would be what part do you want digitized? And but then you're digitizing something that is just for that on demand use. Do you save it?

I mean I guess the other end question to that is are you digitizing and saving the file and making that available so there's a whole lot more?

That statement grows and grows if you look at it that way.

MR. ACKEROYD: Yes, this is Richard Ackeroyd from New Mexico.

I think what makes this provocative, statement provocative is exactly the conversation that's, that we've been having up to this point, but it seems to me that we have a history of doing things in the library world in an on demand way and that is that sometimes we catalog materials that are
in a queue waiting to be catalogued if somebody demands them. Once they are in somebody's hands when they come back, we catalog them right away. On your book Mobiles, we do a lot of things after people have asked for or demanded something. We then get it into the queue if we don't already have it there.

It seems to me that in an -- with some kind of organization around this we might be able to see this as a way of gradually getting things digitized that we, that we might not otherwise have done or have waited a long time to do it. But I do think that once we go through the process of digitizing something, we certainly would save it and then you, so that it can be used again and again.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill. If the regionals are going to take this on, I would think they would want to make sure that they scan it in a method that is compatible with the GPO specifications for the FDsys.

MS. MILLER: This is Ann Miller at Duke. I have one thing, I mean is this, for me the question is is this digitization or preservation
and access or is this digitization for use. And if it's digitization for use, then, you know, we're going to scan it the way we do in our library alone and send it on.

I do think that making this kind of blanket commitment could get people into trouble. I mean if someone comes to me or comes to my regional and says I'd like you to scan the Atlas to the company the War of the Rebellion, which is, you know, about this big (indicating), and maps, I don't think maps, you know, are feasible for anyone to do.

So I think, I see it -- I would like to see it as Bill was talking about it where within certain reasonable limits, that that is a potential service that could be provided, but I also don't think it necessarily has to be only the regionals that provide this service. I think also there are those of us who have the facilities or the capabilities to do this, but I think we need to be very clear that this is digitization to get it to a person who wants it in electronic form. This is not digitization that is going to have to meet standards, that is going to be ingested in the
FDsys, because then we have to provide, then we are providing the metadata issue and if we want to do that, then it's a different provocative statement.

MR. SUDDUTH: And again, it's, it's good to bring this up because our digitization unit is, or program is very young and it's still searching for what it should and should not do.

So, to have this out there in my case would allow me to go and say this is a possibility, how would we handle this and, and, you know, what are our limits, because we've gone back and forth on that. I've done some on demand things and then told, well, don't tell anybody you're doing this.

It's like, but you know, sometimes the cat is out of the bag. It depends on the format, too.

Maybe there is someone -- maybe there will be one library out there that does get the equipment and can do the larger formats, you know.

I wish we could.

MS. FRANGAKIS: Can I interject the preservation voice here?

Are we talking about things that will eventually make it to the GPO's digitization
At New York public we have an approach that, that is a public service oriented approach but also meets preservation needs for other types of re-formatting projects. Actually we do it with digital, as well, in which a patron requests something, so it's sort of, you know, an on demand request, but what we do in our re-formatting efforts is perform them to accepted preservation standards and best practices so that, A, we will have an institutional preservation copy and record of that item and we won't have to do it again. No one will have to do it again because we've already done it and we provide the bibliographic control for that item to let other institutions know that we have done it.

So, in an effort to minimize both duplication of effort and some cost effectiveness in terms of long-term resource expenditures, I just throw that out there as another way of doing it.

MS. MCANINCH: I hate to cut council off, but we do have only three minutes left and we have five audience members. I'm not sure, I think
you were first.

MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library.

I mean I guess I basically at the moment agree with Ann in the sense that if you start bringing in new preservation aspect of this, you will get pushed back from the regionals because everybody is not ready for that level of digitization. Some are, some aren't, and if they can do it, great.

But I think the real point is any institution that's a regional that is not using some form of digitization to accomplish their ILL activities in other areas is way behind the curve. So I don't think this is an unreasonable expectation at all, within guidelines like limited pages and all that kind of thing. You do have to have those guidelines, but I don't see any reason why any regional shouldn't be doing this right now.

MS. MCANINCH: Barbie?

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

I guess the should provide is part of
what I'm not sure about because we, anybody can
digitize anything they want from our documents
collection as from fiche or from print if they want
to do it themselves. It obviously as Ann says
wouldn't be to preservation quality, so, you know,
that's another, another aspect of it.

MS. SINCLAIR: I'm Gwen Sinclair from
the University of Hawaii at Manoa Library.
We are a regional, we would be the
library in our region doing this, we don't have any
selectives that would have this capability. You've
asked what would be required for us to take this on?
We do, currently do scanning for
inter-library loan but we would have to purchase
additional scanners, we would have to hire
additional staff, we don't have a fiche scanner
right now, so we would have to purchase a fiche
scanner. This would be a significant cost issue for
us.

Currently we charge 25 cents a page for
people who are not affiliated with our University
for this type of service, so then it becomes a
question of what is a minimal cost, what's
reasonable.

MS. BOBISH: Hi, my name is Mary Beth Bobish, I'm from the New York State Library.

I just wanted to add a comment of what our current copying costs are at our library. We charge a dollar per page. Our document delivery staff will not deliver an electronic document that is over 50 pages as was mentioned earlier, and some preservation issues have been mentioned. We don't have OCR software and I think there are a lot of variations in OCR software out there, so it would not necessarily be a searchable document that is scanned as people have been mentioning earlier, it would just be scanned for providing access to that person at that moment. Thank you.

MS. MCKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls.

I'm a selective, but I'd like to say that if I were the administration of a regional library and I saw this coming at me, I would say what have you done for me lately? Really.

We have, our libraries all have particular institutional missions and if this is not
part of the mission, this is not what they signed on
for as being a regional library and you have to
really look at this. Should they or could they, I
mean, you know, as to whether it's part of their
mission and whether it serves the needs of the
people in their area.

In Wisconsin we have an extremely fine
documents delivery system that would probably work
faster than doing it because it would be out the
door immediately instead of having to wait for a
larger document to be scanned.

So you have to go back and step back
away and look at particular situations for
particular States. In States where things are not
delivered as quickly, larger, more rural States,
this might be a very viable option, but to say that
they should, I don't know.

To say that they could and that it would
be a good thing is, is entirely different.

MS. MCANINCH: Thank you all very much.

We're out of time?

We're going to move on to statement
number two. You can always make further comments to
Geoff or on the little cards.

MS. CANEPA: Laurie Canepa, New Mexico State Library and I have provocative statement number two.

And -- the slides move, so.

And now it may not look provocative on the surface, I have confidence that if you get any more than two documents librarians in a room, even at 8:30 in the morning, anything is provocative.

And the statement is, regional libraries should sponsor in-person or virtual training sessions at least once every quarter. This statement is tied to rationale or goal four of the vision statement which is, provide excellent training to deepen and expand knowledge of Government information resources via excellent training.

Comments?

MS. PARKER: Marian Parker, Wake Forest.

I'm a selective and my regional, Beth, is here. I would hope that all of the regionals and the selectives can begin working together. This is sort of carrying out a theme I started long before
yesterday, but I said it yesterday where we can work
to create virtual training packages, whether they're
self-paced computer instruction, or videos or DVDs
of, you know, people sort of doing an in-person
training with a lot of visuals and share them around
the country. I mean we're all, we all have the same
interests or similar interests.

There are a lot of things that all of us
want to learn and we could put the power of this
huge organization to work and if every regional and
its selective committed to creating one to five
lessons, you know, off a list of things that people
want, all of a should you'd have an entire
curriculum available for people to borrow any time
they wanted to and then it would be very simple to
either have in-person or self-paced training, and
that's the kind of stuff we do all the time.

I just think we don't have a good
mechanism for sharing it with people.

MS. MILLER: This is Ann Miller, from
Duke, and I think one of the things that I'm a
little concerned about with this statement is that
it's this once every quarter and I think we all know
from our library instruction experience that people
learn best at the point of need. They don't learn
best if you're going to a session that's kind of not
affiliated with anything you're actually doing, so I
really like sort of Marian's concept of having a
database of curriculum or training opportunities
that we could go to when, when we need it.

Because I just don't think that -- I
would, I would certainly go if, if my regional
offered these kinds of things and I would certainly
help my regional do this, but I think that unless we
have an active use for it immediately thereafter,
like our students and our public, we will forget it
shortly thereafter.

MR. ACKEROYD: This is Richard Ackeroyd
at the New Mexico State Library.

Marian, we do have a delivery mechanism
we're beginning to explore it with the five-State
training program that Tim has talked about a number
of times and he looks like he's ready to talk about
it again.

But, but anyway, we're exploring a
relationship with Web Junction. They have, already
have a delivery mechanism for an enormous body of training materials that can be taken online and they have been, begun working with their partner States to, to collect other locally-developed curricula that is now shareable across the country and indeed across the world.

So I think building on what we're doing with the IMLS grant program and the relationship that we're establishing with Web Junction, I think it's probably a small step toward working with Web Junction to get a Government document space on Web Junction and get Government documents, training materials there, they are available to anybody when they want them at the point of need or on a scheduled basis.

So, I think we have the really exciting opportunity to take advantage of something that we don't have to develop. Somebody else has already developed the mechanism, we just have to take advantage of it.

MR. SUDDUTH: Thank you.

MS. CANEPA: Comments from council?

All right, we'll move to the familiar.
Ma'am.

MS. ANDERSON: I'm Nancy Anderson from the Library of Michigan, we're the regional for Michigan.

There's a couple of key points here and it didn't really matter whether I stood up for the first provocative statement or the second, it's not a question of whether a regional library does it or a selective library does it or for that matter if the GPO does it.

The key word in this particular statement is sponsor. It's a question of leadership and it, if you use the State data center model that the Census Bureau runs, lead agencies in each State do not guarantee that they will provide every service. They, instead, coordinate the offering of every service throughout the network.

And so it doesn't matter to me whether the regional does the training or the regional does the training, it matters whether or not the regional is even conscious of both abilities and capabilities in their State.

I mean I'm, I'm very fortunate to have
Grace York in Michigan and I would no sooner try to re-do one of her census presentations than I would try to fly. There's no point in that.

And I think that it's more than anything else, it's a question of communication and leadership and coordinating the talents of what we already have.

MS. BURKE: I'm Helen Burke at Minneapolis Public Library. I just want to speak to the tradition that we have in Minnesota established by the regional and the State library association for a forum every, for the past 20 years, in the Spring bringing together documents librarians. It's a two-day session, it's done in person and there's a reliable attendance because everybody knows that this forum is worth going to.

And so I think that compliments the ideas that Marilyn -- Marian and Ann had mentioned about doing it at the point, at the time of need, but also having something in-person that's predictable that people plan to attend.

MR. BULLINGTON: Jeff Bullington,
And we are having discussions like this within the State of Kansas, taking place more under the heading of our State's GODORT group in many ways, but having discussions about making use of our State library's acquisition of OPAL as a framework for providing training both to ourselves, but also trying to create and field training to all the other libraries that are not depositories in certain sets of awareness in and ability to incorporate Government information.

And I think our approach has the benefit of being able to fold in not just Federal, but also State and local kinds of topics, which I'm sure everybody would probably do anyway, but I think this is a laudable goal. It's a question again of resources and capabilities to actually field it and I really agree with Ann Marie, the notion of the regional's responsibility might be to help lead the coordination, but not necessarily carry that entire burden, that would put a lot on all of us, so.

MS. BOBISH: Mary Beth Bobish from the New York State Library.
My question in reading this statement is whether the intended audience are, is the regional delivering this presentation to the selectives or if the intention is just the regional delivering this to anyone who might be interested in learning more about U.S. documents and databases?

I mean we have public training sessions almost weekly for 10 months of the year, not all about U.S. documents obviously, but I'm just questioning whether the intention is for the regionals to deliver this to selectives or is it the regional delivering this to anyone who might make use of U.S. documents?

MS. WEST: Amy West, University of Minnesota.

One question I have is about what the content of the training would be and I was having a conversation the other day with Valerie Glenn at University of North Texas and Dan Barkley, who's also a regional, and Dan and I were talking about, oh, you know, you get those questions for the transmittal from 1975, there was no loose-leaf
binder, and she's like I never get those questions.

And it reminded me that probably the single most popular guide that we have is one that was written by Julie Wallace that explains exactly how you find Atomic Energy Commission documents. And she goes through the legal changes, its changes in depository status and how to find it and the column numbers and everything. It's incredibly popular with other librarians, but it's unlikely for those institutions that don't get questions about the Atomic Energy Commission to be particularly useful.

And so we put a lot of our time into these guides for the more obscure materials rather than some of the basic questions that people would have, and I have no problem with doing training or putting together virtual training sessions, but I do think it would be good to define what it is, because one thing that I'd like to do since we appear to be good at it is to continue to work on guides for some of the more obscure materials that we have.

MS. CANEPA: Move to number three.

MS. HALE: My name is Kathy Hale, I am a
regional for Pennsylvania and I'm from the State Library of Pennsylvania.

Our statement is that every Federal depository library should establish at least one area which it has expertise and be willing to provide training and specialized reference in that area to other libraries.

And I think we're dove-tailing on the provocative statement number 2 in the fact that we do have a lot of training out there, we do have a lot of people who are experts. It has been shown by study after study that people will go to people who are geographically close to them, whether that's in the next cubicle, down the hall, down the street, down the State. So that an example of those in Pennsylvania is the, is the Documents and Maps Association group. This is a group of 14 State Universities in Pennsylvania. They have each committed to collect a specific area that supports their curriculum or activities, so they, in fact, become an expert.

When I come here, there are many experts that I have called on or I have come to to say,
you've done this before and I haven't.

And maybe what we're talking about here is a sort of clearinghouse to say, okay, I, I'm a small public library, I'm not able to come to Washington, I'm not able to go to Reno, Nevada, or Seattle, but I need a place that I can come to if I have a question and my regional can't answer this or a regional could go to to say this person has done a totally digital library or this person has done this type of training before so that we can use each other.

Aren't we our greatest resource to try and get these things together and especially the new Federal depository librarians that we have, that may be the way that they got to their job is that they fell into it and that they had one course in library school on Government documents and I have no idea what I'm doing, or even a regional who has never had those kinds of responsibilities before and have no clue, so that they have a place that they can go to that is available to see that maybe it, like the Eric clearinghouse model in order to have a place that we all can go to the same page and look at what
we are doing with each other.

Council?

MR. BYRNE: This is something that I do in Colorado quite a bit is utilize the depository librarians to do training, and so I see one of my roles as sort of the regional to anoint experts. Often the depository librarians don't think of themselves as experts. I think of it somebody that knows a little bit more than the rest of us is an expert and so I will, you know, look depository, see what their strengths are, E-mail them or call them and say you're doing a presentation, I want 20 minutes on rocks and water. And it works.

MS. HALE: Are you the one that talks so fast like Judy Russell, they can't say no?

MR. WARNICK: That's Judy. Also, you call them experts or maybe call them specialists might be a less extensive term, but the idea is exactly the same. I think provocative statement two and provocative statement three are, have in common that they seem to be calling for a clearinghouse or a registry or something which would be something
that a GPO could assume as an action, a very simple
action so that there would be someplace, just a
listing, really, of these training for statement two
and for reference specialists for reference three.

It seems like it's a natural action to take forward.

MS. TULIS: This is Susan Tulis from
Southern Illinois University.

We do something on our campus, all
faculty can sign up to be an expert in a certain
subject, whether it's, you know, an academic subject
or down to how to do taxes for our students.

And I think dove-tailing with what Walt
just said, you know GPO puts out the call for people
to sign up as an expert in a certain area and then
they can maintain the registry.

MR. WARNICK: This, in fact number two
and number three, but especially number three also
addresses Michele McKnelly's question of
administrator asking the very important question
what's in it for me, what's in it for my
institution.

Because if you have a -- are developing
a specialized expertise that is, you would think
would be something related to your geographic area
or for example in the Michigan, something about the
Great Lakes Commission, for example, and every,
every place in the country would have something like
that, perhaps, and so you have that expertise, but
then in addition, by, by having access to your
colleagues' specialists at other institutions, then
you've actually increased the power of your own
institution because you have that access that you
would not otherwise have.

MS. HALE: Well, and I also think that
this extends to agencies, et cetera, that, for
example, I was at a session yesterday and one of the
people -- I asked one of the people will you come
out, so even having agency contacts of if I want
someone to come to my region, who will that be, who
could that be?

Anyone else from council? Okay, we do
have someone at the mic.

MS. MCKNELLY: There are a couple things
about this.

First of all, I think that this is a
very academically-driven provocative statement
because most academic institutions at the libraries have subject specialists and you all will be glad to know that I know a lot about groundwater. I just, but it's need based. It's based off the needs of my institution and what was happening there at the time and it's never static.

And I think that developing a registry kind of pins people into, you know, that she's the cranberry expert over here and maybe she doesn't want to stay that.

The other thing is is that when Kathy was describing the documents library and I think we have a lot of people in smaller public libraries who have this as a very small percentage of their job and they're never going to be able to develop an expertise and that if you would say your expertise is knowing someone to call, you know, picking up the phone and calling someone, that that would certainly qualify for this because if only 10 percent of their job is devoted to this, they're really not going to be able to develop a comfort library.

And I don't know that public libraries, except for the very large ones, have subject
specialists.

MS. MILLER: This is Ann Miller, at Duke.

I just, I disagree a little bit with you, Michele, I mean I agree with you about the academic part, I think that that's true in that there aren't subject specialists. But I know when I get a question that, that something like how do I find Section 8 housing, I call my public library because I don't know and they are an expert and they have the expertise on some of these things that they get their questions more regularly. I get them because people think Duke knows a lot of stuff and I just don't happen to know that bit.

So I think that, I think there's a level of expertise within every library. You just have to figure out what it is. It may not be something that is registrable, but I think that undervalues what kind of services our public libraries provide. And I know you didn't mean it that way, but I just, yeah.

MS. CANEPA: Ann.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders from the
Library of Michigan.

I think I can bridge that with maybe broadening the statement to not be limited to reference and service, but also to the operation of a depository library. If I need somebody who needs help in how to run a public library depository on very little money, I'm sending them to Fred Kirby and Jill Rauh at Benton Harbor because they do it better than anybody I've ever seen. And they do it with literally, you know, next to nothing. And so that's where I'm going to send them.

And if you broaden it to the operational side and not just the service side, you might be able to bridge that gap a little more easily.

MS. HALE: Or also if you look at the goals at number four, the first one it also talks about a reference service. I was part of the Government information online pilot project and a lot of us are doing virtual reference type of things that this also might be part of the mix.

MR. ACKEROYD: This is Richard Ackeroyd from New Mexico.

I, I just need to take a little issue
with, with the statement about, about what public libraries are capable of. We have an enormous number of small rural libraries throughout New Mexico and I am constantly surprised at the level of expertise and the kind of service that they provide. And I think any of you who might like to come out there and take a look around some of our small public libraries and see what they're doing would be equally impressed, so I wouldn't minimize that at all. I think there's a lot to offer out there.

MR. BYRNE: Tim Byrne, University of Colorado.

One of the things that I often find in doing the, you know, BI with classes at CU is that that's where I develop my expertise. I get asked to do a class I don't know anything about. I have to then develop the expertise. I then, this is the same thing I do with the training that I get the depository librarians to do, is that they're not necessarily experts, but once they pick a topic and work on it.

So, I have several public librarians who are very, very reluctant to get involved because
they are not full-time documents librarians, they
don't have the, you know, the background and
expertise, but when I say I think you can do this,
you come in and do just absolutely fantastic jobs.

MS. MILLER: Just one last thing and I'm
not -- the thing I think we might want to think
about when we're looking at expertise is maybe not
limiting it to subject or to, you know, like I know
all about the Department of Interior.

I think perhaps something like how do
you start a small business, you know, I'm a
hairdresser and I'm in a small town and I want to
know how do I start a small business, where do I go
for information. How do I find out whether I'm
getting enough -- how do I find everything I need to
find out about social security and how can I read it
and where is it available.

So I think if we start, that's the other
thing I think that sometimes happens with training,
and I'm as guilty of it as anybody else is, you
know, it's, it's framed in a, not a particularly
attractive way and we need to find from our users
what the hook is. I mean again, what are they
wanting to find out. Are they establishing small businesses, are they looking to sell a small crop that they're starting to grow.

Figure out what the need is and then teach to the need as opposed to giving them something that they may or may not actually want.

MS. HALE: I'm sorry, in the interest of time, we'll have to table your discussion. Thank you.

MS. SWANBECK: Hi, I'm Jan Swanbeck from University of Florida and this is a provocative statement.

All Federal depository library collections should be catalogued by the end of the decade. And I would just say we did a dry run of this at our regional meeting Sunday morning, again, bright and early and when this statement was read, everyone burst out laughing.

So, including me, this is something I've been involved with since those of you who remember Judy Meyers at University of Houston back in the late '70s, early '80s, we, I was at Texas A&M, participated in a grant that actually did result in
the marchive retrospective tapes, but another
component of it was pre-'76 cataloging. And we, we
had a plan and that was many, many years ago of
that, so.

We're still talking about it. I think
this is wildly improbable. We've been talking about
it at this meeting. As a matter of fact, there was
a whole session devoted to metadata and cataloging
topics. Cataloging wasn't really discussed, but
there was a handout provided by Laurie that dealt
with cataloging priorities and the possibility of
partnering with depository libraries to do this.

And we also heard from DTIC how they're
creating minimal records using metadata. It was
very intriguing and would seem a possible way to do
it, so.

Council? Come on, we've been talking
about it for years.

MS. MILLER: Well, I can't disagree with
the statement. I mean, you know, it's, yeah. Well
yeah.

And I'll go home and catalog, I mean
I'll set myself 10 documents a day, you know, let's
figure this out.

Yeah, sure, why not, but I, you know, I don't think we're going to make it, but I do think that we can give it a damn good try. What's there to say.

MR. SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth. I think some of it is perception, again, because of the amount of material I'm sending to my annex, I keep looking for these huge gaps of where I don't find records and I'm only finding these little gaps of where I don't find records.

So my perception over the last three years is there, there have been projects, there's the five colleges in Ohio, there's actually the Virginia State library that has put tons of records in there and I only find these little, teeny gaps.

Now, what happens when I find these gaps is I create a template, records get put in my catalog. They are not going to OCLC; why, do you see I don't have the blessings, the authority and whatever, but I have records in my catalog. Somebody could harvest that, you know, pull those records out.
So, I -- it's possible. I mean my, my,
I guess I'm more of a glass half full on this is
that to me I think it's possible. Will it get done,
I'm not going to bet on that, but.

MS. MILLER: Well, this is Ann Miller,
again. I, some of it has to do with forming good,
if we're not a cataloger already, forming good
relationships with our catalogers and you might be
surprised at their willingness to accept what we
might not think they are willing to accept.

We, we do not put in -- we don't put
short records in our catalog. We put short records,
minimal level record cataloging in OCLC because it
doesn't do anybody good, I mean other than us, to
put it in just our catalog. It doesn't -- but we
have the okay to put this kind of record in OCLC
from our catalogers because they would rather have
access than no access at all.

And we've got the training and we've got
the ability now.

Now, we still are doing it one by one by
one and hand typing the stuff in and this is where
the kinds of things where we saw the DTIC
demonstration, anything that can speed up the
process is a good thing. But, you know, I hear
people say oh, my catalogers won't let me do that.
Well I have lunch with my catalogers every day and
that's how I got it done. It's like make friends
with your catalogers because, you know, you might be
surprised.

MR. SUDDUTH: And this sounds like we're
getting to a debate that maybe we should do
somewhere else, but again, part of my perception is
if I put it in my catalog, it's, we've got, we're
going to have a State-wide union catalog, so at
least my State sees it and we also participate in
KUDZO, which means there's 15 other ascorbic
libraries that see it. And so we get back to the is
it, is it got to be in OCLC kind of thing, which, I,
I think it should be. I mean I, that's, there's
that guilt factor in there, so.

But, back to my original statement is
there's a lot that's already out there and I think
it's, we're almost left with that hard 20 percent
that has to be just tackled.

MR. BYRNE: This is Tim Byrne again.
I'm not a cataloger, but I supervise five of them and if we have to go title by title through our collection, we will never catalog it by the end of the decade. But if we can load large batch files of records, we may have a chance.

And the interesting thing is of course I've been batch loading records for quite a while now and I've been the oddball in our library. The rest of the cataloging department, you know, they're committed to, you know, the perfect record. But things are changing and now they're coming around to our point of view. They're looking at the only way that they can get in 44,000 records that we have for electronic serials now is to batch load those records.

And, so, it's, the world is changing right now in terms of cataloging and how we get cataloging records is changing also.

MS. WEST: Amy West, University of Minnesota.

I'm not sure I actually totally agree with what I'm about to say, but I think I'm just going to throw it out there anyway.
Having never actually catalogued anything, my primary knowledge of cataloging came from class in library school and what I do remember vividly is that one of the primary tenants is that the catalog record is supposed to stand in as a surrogate for the item.

And what I'm wondering is if we have multiple libraries with massively large documents collections and the recent edition of both the University of Wisconsin and Wisconsin State historical society where (inaudible) to focus exclusively on or primarily on public documents, then in the relatively near future there's going to be a substantial number of publications that are readily to hand and while that doesn't mean there shouldn't be some structured descriptive information, maybe this is a problem that will, to a considerable extent, go away in the near future.

I mean we have a shelf list, we have an inventory of what we have. Maybe the University of Minnesota doesn't need to actually add those records to our catalog since the likelihood of someone finding something in Google is substantially higher.
than them finding it in our catalog.

MS. PROPHET: Mary Prophet, Denison University Library.

When we started the five colleges project, we estimated that it would take us 10 to 15 years to do it. We're doing it for four colleges.

Denison and Wooster are completely finished. We finished over a year ago and except for a few odds and ends on maps.

And I would agree with Bill, the more we got into the project, the farther we got into the project, the fewer things we found that did not have good records in OCLC.

The last two years, three years of our project we had a tec pro contract with OCLC and we've sent anything that we did not have catalogued to them by the end of the last year, we were out of stuff. Stuff that we could not find three years earlier we were finding by the end of that time.

So the records are getting there a lot faster than you might think.

And the other thing is even though it
took us quite a while to do it, if we had never
started, we wouldn't have gotten there. And so some
of you have already started and that's wonderful,
but there are people who haven't started and the
only thing to do is just start and do it.
I think the title of one of your
presentations here was just do it and I agree with
that, just do it.
MS. STEWART: Tammy Stewart, Missouri
State University, Springfield, Missouri.
I've got to get your rotten vegetables
ready to start throwing and everything, but I've got
a dollars question.
Is this an effective use of our time? I
know that people over me would say no because we
have retrospective records in our catalog back to
1976 and they still don't get used.
So I'm not sure that it would improve
the usage of it and since I'm the only full-time
librarian dealing with documents now, I don't have
realistic hope that this is ever going to happen.
We do try to, you know, get some when they get
checked out back into the catalog and get a full
record, but it, it's very difficult.

MR. SUDDUTH: Well, I mean in my guess, fortunate -- and in response to this, fortunately when I have older, fragile and rare materials and the best place for that to be is in our storage facility, then I have to have the record to get it to my storage facility.

So, if it's something that isn't a record, we, we will, we do it and we try to create it, so, you know, we're still trying to send that material there because it's going to preserve it for a lot longer.

So, I mean it's, that, but that's just one library. I mean there, there are people whose storage facilities are getting full and they are not engaging in this process, so.

MS. MILLER: Yeah, and I would add, I'm cataloging, we've, we've just currently catalogued our entire League of Nations collection which had never been catalogued before and we have also, we're now working on cataloging our Rand collection.

The League collection was just to get it out there and we have seen an increase in use. The
Rand collection I'm doing because I've got to move my collection again in two to three years and I think it might have to go to off site.

So my, my driving force for cataloging things is partly to get it out there and get people to see it, but partly because I'm not sure how long it's going to stay on site and it's just a heck of a lot easier to have it done ahead of time than it is for me to have to go into emergency mode and get it out.

MS. CANEPA: Okay, we're out of time.

MS. HARPER: Hi, my name is Laura Harper, I'm from the University of Mississippi. I'm the regional from Mississippi.

Provocative statement number five.

Comprehensive virtual collections managed cooperatively by FDLs in a State or region are an essential part of FDLP's mission and should be encouraged. This statement is related to the third goal in the vision statement. Ensure continuing access to digitally-available Government information.

The latest biennial survey results show
that 18 percent of depository reports that they are currently downloading, storing locally and making accessible from 1 to 25 files I think is the, the most of these, of these respondents were really currently downloading a small number of files, but 33 percent were willing to accept digital files on deposit from GPO and 28 percent of these were willing to accept less than 100 files.

So, should regionals have the responsibility of building virtual comprehensive collections in their State? Should they be assisted cooperatively by selectives?

MS. STIERHOLZ: By virtual -- this is Katrina, by virtual collections, you mean digital deposit collections?

MS. HARPER: Right.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Not just electronic, okay.

MS. HARPER: Anyone from the audience? Amy?

MS. WEST: Amy West, University of
Minnesota.

Yeah, I think so, I mean one of the defining characteristics of a regional is that you acquire and retain in perpetuity the materials that are part of the FDLP, so I think that digital distribution certainly needs that requirement.

You know, I think that the cost comparison between maintaining servers over time and migrating formats as you go is probably comparable to what it cost to heat and light a building and to pay staff to be there to provide assistance.

There are other issues of what you would do with those records once you have them. Do they sit there as potential substitutes in case the Website ever goes down or are the materials not otherwise available, but that is something that I think could be worked out, so, this is at least one regional or -- for the time being who says yeah.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

My only concern about this is duplication across multiple institutions with multiple versions and then having to sort out what's current and what's not.
I would say that perhaps the statement applies for Government information which the GPO does not provide.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Yeah, Pete, I look at this and I think what a lot of server space -- this is Katrina.

I, I mean I think in theory this makes reasonable sense. I can't imagine 50, you know, 50 States, 50 virtual collections, 50 digital deposit collections of everything that is electronic. You know, it means GPO Access in essence 50 times over and that just seems very, it's a lot of duplication.

So, I, I mean this seems very expensive and I'm not sure that the return is there.

MR. HEMPHILL: You know if you have a rare, if you have a rare collection of information that GPO could benefit by or the rest of the folks could benefit by, I'd say go for it.

If it's information that's commonly available through GPO, I would say I would think think about that carefully because you may be duplicating effort.
MS. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski from the California State Library.

I, I know that this topic is going to come up again later this morning in spades, but I, I agree with Amy that in theory regionals should ideally be able to do this; however, it's important to realize that while most regionals are academic institutions, there are regionals such as mine that are State libraries and there are two regionals that are public libraries.

I know that in my State for us to implement this would take probably five years of, of filing action plans, requests with State Government to get permission to do this. Because in our State, doing anything with information technology takes at least a year and it's very, very difficult to do.

I personally find intellectually the difference between storing books and providing money to do that and providing money to store digital files to be, you know, the same type of thing.

But, there are bureaucratic structures for IT projects in certain jurisdictions that seem to throw up roadblocks to this.
And so, you know, in theory it, it's a good thing. But in reality, if you're going to have different types of regionals other than academic institutions and keep them in this program, then those have to be taken, those road blocks have to be taken into considerations for those who do not have large IT operations on academic campuses.

MR. BULLINGTON: Jeff Bullington, University of Kansas.

Again, a goal with some merits and things like that and for those of you who have heard it before, please bear with me. The Kansas county analogy. Kansas has 105 counties in it for a relatively small State.

The value behind that was those district lines were drawn so that a person would only have one day's travel to their county seat of Government in order to have equitable access to the Governmental structure. That worked well when those counties were set up 150 years ago. If we re-drew those now, how many might we have?

The goal behind this ought to be reasonable redundancy of the electronic collection
to provide safety for and preservation for the
future and equitable access and timely access, but
it may be that 53 such collections may not be as
needed any more in that way of the electronic.

I mean the print may still, that may
still be the same way, but it's, let's look back to
what the value and the purpose behind it is and then
draw our map forward instead of using the same map
and then just making everything fit within it.

MS. CANEPA: Thank you.
Arlene?

MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from the
Oregon State Library.

I, I keep coming back to what Ann Marie
said about leadership in regionals and where we are,
we, we tend to be so bogged down by the model of the
regional system that we don't think outside of it
enough and I think this is a really good example of
that.

Nobody thinks that every regional
library should do this. I mean it's just, it is
unreasonable, but every regional library in each
50 States or however it's actually divided up should
provide some leadership in their State about talking about this issue with the institutions that can consider thinking about this.

I, the, the value of virtual collections is they don't have to be all in one place and to think that we want to put that model on to the virtual collection model is just ridiculous. But what we need is leadership and coordination and I really, really hope that those that are in regionals who are thinking we can't even think about this are thinking about how they can talk to other institutions in their State to talk about it.

MS. CANEPA: Thank you.

Any other comments?

MR. HEMPHILL: I guess related to this I have a question for GPO in that how are they prioritizing what is going to be digitizing, when, and how are they going to communicate that to the FDLs so that they know what's going to be up and available?

MRS. RUSSELL: We went through a process several years ago working with the community and
analyzing the most heavily-used materials on GPO Access and put up a document on our legacy digitization Website that is the current priorities for digitization that could, of course, always be re-visited, but essentially to start building backwards from the most popular GPO databases, which both given the nature of our databases and given the usage patterns on our databases focuses heavily on legal and, core legal and regulatory materials, but there is a document up there and up until this point no one has raised the issue of wanting to kind of re-visit those priorities, although obviously that could be done if, if the focus of the community changed.

We've also been working with organizations like Katrina's, we're going to be having conversations with the National Agriculture Library, USGS, other places where digitization projects are going on so that we're taking advantage of what others are doing in sort of filling in the puzzle and not trying to duplicate that.

MR. HEMPHILL: Thank you.

MS. CANEPA: Any other comments?
Okay. I think we're ready for the provocative statement number six.

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay. The statement is with the exception of essential reference materials and rare or endangered items, a comprehensive circulating collection should be maintained within the boundaries of each State or region.

Region here is undefined, by the way. Make no assumptions about the boundaries of that region.

With, we all know, I think, some of the reasoning behind this. With space considerations at both regionals and selectives, with much of the current FDLP collection currently available online, directors and collection managers are starting to look at valuable library shelf space and say why -- they're increasingly loathed to commit that space to collections that duplicate other collections at nearby institutions or institutions that are within, let's say, inter-library loan distance.

And, so, of course we're thinking about this in terms not just of the FDLP, this is really not an FDLP question so much in many respects as it
is a cooperative collection development issue.

And the only way we can do cooperative collection development is if we can move materials around.

Council?

MR. BYRNE: Tim Byrne. I'm finding that as more and more material becomes available electronic, especially the older material, I'm finding less and less need to have things non-circulating.

You know, in the past it was always we had to keep the serial set here so it's available when one needs it, but I don't need to do that anymore. So more and more of my collection is circulating.

MS. STIERHOLZ: It seems like, this is Katrina, it seems like an odd statement, too, in light of provocative statement number one where we're digitizing everything for everybody and then now we're going to circulate it, too.

I think between the two it might make sense to pick the priority that matters the most. We want to be able to circulate physical documents,
because I assume we're talking about physical documents here or do we want to make available material perhaps electronically and on demand and not be so concerned about circulating things?

MR. SWINDELLS: Gwen.

MS. SINCLAIR: I'm Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii at Manoa Library.

My University is under great pressure to why don't you digitize everything, why are we keeping all those old documents? And my response to that is that a lot of our students and a lot of our patrons don't have Internet access at home.

It's great to make everything digital and that's what everybody seems to want, but there's a significant number of people out there who don't have the ability to have materials delivered to their desktop. They don't have a computer or they don't have the bandwidth.

So, I think it's extremely important for us to maintain materials that can be circulated to people who want to take it home, otherwise we're condemning this 30 percent of people to always have to come in to the library to use depository
materials because they'll have no ability to take it home with them.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill. Will print on demand solve that issue?

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

I get -- I mean I use the P word, print collection as opposed to circulating collection, because part of this, I mean it's that whole light archive, dark archive, GPO's got everything, but, you know, I mean it's, it's a preservation, it's keeping it in print somewhere, I think. I mean at least in part, so.

MS. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think we have to have this conversation in light of State and institutional policies and that if you detach this and just talk about Federal Government collections, you know, that we're way off the mark here.

That our institutions all define what circulates based on the needs of our local constituents in that we can't come in and just say, you know, well I'm going to change that for this, but we have to get up and talk about other resource
sharing, too, which is, most States is pretty well
developed and highly sophisticated and that we need
to go back and look at institutional missions again
and cooperation within States.

MS. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm from the
Indiana State Library and most of our patrons are
historians and genealogists and they do want the
materials. There's very little pressure on us to
have them electronic. On the other hand, we're very
close to Indiana University and they have more
electronics.

So I think there's room for all of us
and that our patrons would lose if we decided on one
or the other State-wide.

MR. SWINDELLS: That may be it? Last
questions? We may break early.

Okay, I want to thank -- oh, Dan
Barkley.

MR. BARKLEY: Hi, Dan Barkley,
University of New Mexico.

Number one, I have cataloging envy with
Tim, because he's got five and I have none and
catalogers bring out pepper spray when I approach
them, so, I don't know why that happens.

With this statement and number one I'd like to thank council for developing these provocative statements. I'm not sure I find any of them provocative, but I think them interesting and intriguing and that's the whole point of generating some conversation here.

I think a lot of the regionals without, with few exceptions are doing this. I know we do, our colleagues up in Santa Fe, we share our resources as much as possible, we circulate a variety of our collections. I'm even willing in some cases to let certain rare and endangered materials go if I know the person, so I'm kind of wondering what was the thought behind the development of this statement in terms of is this something many people aren't doing anymore, is this something regionals aren't performing anymore?

And in part to answer Peter's question of Gwen, we do do print on demand. If we have something that, for example, Laurie or a patron up in Santa Fe needs, we'll either loan it or make a copy of it for them, regardless of the size.
We don't have much of a digital collection right now. And I have to I guess wonder with all the digitization going on, is this in part the motivation behind statement number six, as we digitize parts of our collection and we kind of take the binding apart where they can't circulate it anymore, is this -- I'm just kind of curious with council as to the reasoning and thoughts behind this, not that it's --

MR. SWINDELLS: That's not council's fault.

MR. BARKLEY: All right, well, then I'll blame you, it's Geoff's fault.

MR. SWINDELLS: Yeah, it's my fault.

MR. BARKLEY: Thank you.

MR. SWINDELLS: No, this is just a lot of collections do not circulate, a lot of documents collections do not circulate in various ways. Some circulates it in a library loan. Some do not circulate directly, so.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, UVA.

But also part of it is that region thing and the shared regional and, you know, if I don't,
if I let UNC have EPA, then I'll take War Department
or I mean it's obviously getting at that and
something that we're all very interested in
pursuing.

MR. SWINDELLS: Yeah.

Okay. Thank you very much.

(Applause).

MR. SWINDELLS: I guess we have one

more. One last.

MR. YARNALL: I'm, and (inaudible)
carefully because generally I've never, I've only
spoken once before at a DLC meeting and I'm Richard
Yarnall and I'm the section head of the Government
document sections of the Library of Congress, and my
section acquires the documents for the libraries
collection.

And what, and under Title 44 of the
U.S. Code, we get paper editions of almost
everything that GPO prints and what I want to point
out to council and to the other documents librarians
here is that this has created a unique situation in
that right now the Library of Congress has the only
circulating collection of current Federal
publications in the nation. 90 percent of the material going to the regionals is electronic, correct, Judy?

MRS. RUSSELL: Well, 92 percent is online, whether or not it's also tangible, so I think in the handout it's 25 percent of the material that's online is also available in tangible form and then another 8 or 9 percent is available only in tangible form, so.

MR. YARNALL: Right, so basically my collection, our collection, your collection at the Library of Congress is very unique right now.

And I'm not sure that this is good. My personal opinion. Now I'm not speaking as a Federal employee, I'm not sure that this is a good situation for the country and that as we discuss this and think about this further, it puts a real different spin on where we as a community are moving.

You know, do you really want LC to be, have the only paper copies, what if LC changes our mind. We could, you know, like our collection policy committee could go and change their mind. We could go all electronic and save the taxpayers lots
of money. I think that's what we'd like to do, too.

But there's a preservation and a responsibility for the nation's memory to have circulating copies of tangibles, at least my personal opinion. And I think this is an important question and I'm very thankful that the council put this in a vision statement and is raising this issue. And I just wanted to point out that, golly, this is where we're walking to and that we know this together, that this is what's -- what may well happen. Thank you.

MR. ACKEROYD: This is Richard Ackeroyd at the New Mexico State Library.

Richard, could you stay at the mic, please.

MR. YARNALL: I knew I should have gone to the other meeting at work.

MR. ACKEROYD: Provocative statements result in provocative statements, right.

Anyway, could you, could you just clarify for everybody what, what you mean when you say that the Library of Congress has the only circulating collection of documents? How do they
circulate, who has access to them and things like
that?

I, you and I have talked about this
before, but I'm not sure that everybody has an
understanding of exactly what you mean when you say
that.

MR. YARNALL: There are two ways that
documents come to the library's collection. One is
that our serial and Government documents division is
a selective and they select quite a bit, you know,
whatever a 90 percent selective is now. But that's
a separate collection and it's not permanent.

Under Title 44 of the U.S. code, we are
entitled to up to 25 copies of any Federal
publication. These come into my section.

We do a selection based upon our
collection policy statements and they are put into
the permanent collection in the Library of Congress,
Congress, I can't speak, getting nervous, and they
are part of the permanent collection that will
circulate just like any other book or serial in the
library's collection.

So, if you want a copy of a soil survey,
we will have a copy, a paper copy of that soil
survey in the library's collection. If you want an
EPA document that's published and we select, it's
there. And we select quite a bit in tangibles now
because until my administration who's much higher in
the food chain than I am tell me differently, it is
the policy of the Library of Congress that the only
thing that is archival in nature is paper and fiche.
We know how to keep paper and fiche alive for 100 to
200 years. No one has told me how we are going to
keep an electronic document alive, sorry, Judy, for
200 years.
And that's just our policy and I will
march that policy until my administration tells me
to march somewhere else.
MR. ACKEROYD: Okay, I just, but again,
I just want to clarify, so if I want that soil
survey for a patron in Santa Fe, I can request that
on inter-library loan from the Library of Congress
and receive it?
MR. YARNALL: That's correct.
MR. ACKEROYD: Okay.
MR. YARNALL: Assuming it's gotten
through cataloging, has been bound. I don't want to embarrass our, anybody and say how long it takes for some of our material to get on to the shelf, you know. But that's a true statement and that's why I said that we have the only circulating comprehensive copy and it's not totally comprehensive, we don't select everything. You know, we select on a research level.

MR. WARNICK: Just, well go ahead, go ahead.

MR. ACKEROYD: I was just going to say thank you.

MR. WARNICK: Just to make one further clarification, for those 60 or 70 percent of items that GPO makes available only in electronic format, do you then blow that back and then circulate the hard copy? Or not?

MR. YARNALL: If we, if we select a hard copy.

MR. WARNICK: If you select the electronic copy --

MR. YARNALL: We don't select electronic.
MR. WARNICK: You don't, you just don't
do that.

MR. YARNALL: We don't do that. I have
no place to store electronic material. GPO has to
commit itself to permanent public access of
electronic material and we are not pointing to it at
all. If you want electronic material, I would
assume that you'd be going to GPO Access and looking
for it there, not through our catalog.

MR. WARNICK: Great. Thanks.

MR. YARNALL: Thank you.

MR. SWINDELLS: Thank you.

Okay, thanks very much.

(Short break taken.)

(End of 8:30 a.m. session.)
(Beginning of 10:30 a.m. session.)

MR. SUDDUTH: There's a handout for the next session on the stage up here and I want to get started in two minutes and I really do want to get started right at 10:30 a.m. for this next one.

As I said a moment ago, there are handouts on the next session on the stage and we'd like to get started promptly at 10:30 a.m.

It's nice to see that so many people are still here on a Wednesday morning and give everybody a chance to get in their seats and before we start the last session, there is some business the council would like to take care of and a couple of announcements.

One thing I want to remind everybody, if you have not gone to the registration desk and pick up your CE certificates, they are at the registration desks and get those when you have a chance at the end -- or I mean at the end of the session before you leave. Don't forget those.

Council has some other business that we've taken care of. We always have a secretary and
Ann Miller has volunteered and agreed to be our secretary for the coming year, so I want to thank Ann for that.

As per tradition, during the Fall meeting the next class, which is the class of 2008, caucused, got together, nominated an incoming chair and then the rest of council just nodded, which is what we do because you, it's about all we can do, sometimes, and Geoff Swindells will be our incoming chair.

That's --

(Applause)

And I hope I've, can fool him and make it look easy so that he can find reality next year. No.

Being chair is very nice, you get lots of support from all the previous chairs and lots of nods.

Also want to thank the folks who have been out at the registration desk, Lance, Nick and Yvonne, but particularly Lance who, and I do logistics at my library when we do events, I know
how hard his job is. It's just, it's rare to see
him not moving. It's nice to see him just being
able to lean against the wall, which I'm sure that's
about all you feel like you can do at this point.

So, we need to give all three of those
guys, a --

(Applause)

Another reminder, the next meeting of
the depository library council will be in the Spring
and as the tradition over the last few years, we
will be west of the Mississippi.

So if you're from west of the
Mississippi and you came here, go back, tell all
your folks it's going to be a lot closer and come.
And it's going to be in Denver April 15th through
the 18th. Again, the downside of that is your tax
forms will have to be filed. I don't want to say no
because it's so electronic now.

Again, before we get to the program,
there's one of the, a bit of business that we like
to do. We, we don't have the production that we had
last night and I hope most of you were able to

attend the ceremony that honored Judy last night.
It was a wonderful ceremony and some, a lot of
wonderful things said.
And it would be so easy, it would have
been so easy for me to sit there with a piece of
paper and write it all down and just repeat it.
I've known Judy since 1987 because
that's the first depository library council meeting
I went. It was actually right across the street in
the Holiday Inn Capitol Hill. It was the Fall
meeting. I have other stories related to that
meeting. It was the first one I ever went to. I
actually got to the hotel at about 11:00 p.m. at night
having traveled by train and was just exhausted and
I got greeted at the desk with, oh, Mr. Sudduth,
your reservation is for tomorrow night.
Luckily they asked me if I knew someone
at the meeting and the next thing I knew, there was
Ridley Kessler screaming out of one end of the
telephone saying yeah, he can share the room with
me. But that was my first council meeting. I do
remember one thing, that is sometime during the
meeting or after the meeting soon after Ridley
Kessler told me Judy Russell, she's smart, she works
hard and that's damn scary when you have both.

Back then you didn't know how long, how many times you were going to run into someone, but Judy came back to GPO in 198(?) -- 1991 and took over EADS and that's the electronic dissemination took off then.

Ann and I have several memories of working with or sometimes maybe contrary when Judy was an ILMS and Ann was chair of GODORT and I was chair of legislation and we were up in Washington several times and it was, it's been very nice to have Judy here as Superintendent of Docs for the last almost four years.

So, thank you for that. Before, we have a little gift before that, we do have August Emholtz, he has something he would like to say, or August.

MR. EMHOLTZ: Thank you, Bill. With apologies to Edward Lear.

How pleasant to know Mrs. Russell who published such volumes of stuff, but she never loses a tussle, but all think her pleasant enough. Her mind's concrete and fastidious, her heart remarkably
capacious. She thinks tangible items hideous, and yet she's very perspicacious. She seconds venerable old GPO with thousands of books wall to wall. Occasionally sips a fine Pinot Grigo, but never gets tipsy at all. She reads and also speaks Spanish. She cannot abide ginger. Ere the days of her long career vanish, how pleasant to know Mrs. Russell. 

(Applause)

MR. SUDDUTH: Again, Judy, thank you and this is just a, just a very small token that's from council and for all your hard work and working with us, in tough times, in good times and also challenging us because that's what you've done over the last couple of years is made us better by challenging us.

MRS. RUSSELL: Thank you so much.

(Applause)

MR. SUDDUTH: Well, we had a special committee, I mean don't look at me thinking scarves.

Like any good council, we had a subcommittee that went out and we made an appropriation and had this select committee go and purchase the item, so. So, let's move on to our program, the
rest of our program, digital distribution to
depository libraries and it is Ted Priebe is going
to be our moderator and first presenter and thank
you.

MR. PRIEBE: Well this is a tough
follow-up after following on that one last
opportunity to say thanks to Judy for everything.
I'm here to talk about digital
distribution and for today's topic, much like the
development of GPO's future digital system, GPO is
exploring the topics of what that system has to do
specifically for digital distribution.

So today's discussion and that briefing
document that's out front, if anyone hasn't had an
opportunity to get one, is about the how, the
details -- or excuse me, it's about the what, it's
about what. How that gets implemented is something
that's going to follow, so today's discussion really
is about what the GPO needs to do, what the future
digital system needs to do.

In today's digital information age,
distribution of these FDLP publications in the ink
tangible digital form to Federal depository
libraries is an evolutionary step in transforming
the 20th Century model of distribution into tangible
publications.

Throughout the conference we've heard
from people and the common theme has been about
evolution and transforming and electronic, knowing
that there are still places for the tangible
publications, but we're clearly evolving.

When you think a bit about the evolution
of GPO and the technologies as a whole, when you
start out back in the '60s where it was strictly ink
on paper and then migrating into the '70s with the
edition of our friendly micro forms, moving into the
1990s, the addition of the tangible electronic
products with the CD ROMS, eventually evolving into
DVDs and other forms and then in 1994, the advent
of, the initiation of GPO Access and the access to
the online resources.

Some of the positive affects of what's
happened in that evolution in terms of the born
digital content and the distribution, certainly one
of the first things is the improvement in
comprehensiveness of the collection. Second, and
probably most important to all of us here, is the expansion to public access.

The results of this transformation as it's evolving is certainly an increase in information born digital. We've all seen that and we've heard that theme as well across the past several days. And along with that evolution of born digital content is the correspondence and decrease in tangible distribution of those products as they go more on electronic format.

Much like today's model, people can download content from GPO one of two ways, primarily with GPO Access as most of us know, but also through the PURLs that are relevant in the cataloging, as well.

What we're looking for in our goals today are really to seek information specific to the future digital system and the requirements of it for digital distribution. We will continue to have the ability that you have now with GPO Access in terms of how you can access that content, but we want to also delve into these issues of developing new specific requirements for how content could be
distributed out in addition to being the current form where it's a pull, there's an opportunity for a push and a pull or a variety of things, automated means as well.

What I'd like to do is go through all of the assumptions first and then give council an opportunity to validate or express their comments and then open it up to the audience. And then after that, we'll go through the questions with council and look forward to that discussion.

So, assumption number one, consistent with other formats, GPO will distribute authentic digital publications in formats intended for public access.

Assumption two, the characteristics of digital publications vary so significantly from tangible products that new and more flexible guidelines for managing them in depository libraries will need to be developed.

Number three, preservation of the source files called archival information packages in the future digital system will be the responsibility of GPO and its preservation partners.
Number four, for a majority of content, digital distribution represents another format choice that can be selected in addition to print, microfiche and tangible electronic products.

Number five, libraries receiving FDLP digital publications would be responsible for providing sufficient infrastructure, including bandwidth and storage to provide timely and effective public access.

Number six, libraries would need to ensure that they are providing access to the same versions of a digital publication that are available from GPO.

I'd like to open it up to council,

specific to the assumptions, any comments or questions?

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill. One thing on assumption number one that may not be entirely accurate, we found in private industry where the type of access is different for downloading sometimes, particularly in the area of data mining and research. There may be, it may not necessarily be in the same format intended for
public access. It may be in an XML format or other
digital format that allows perhaps an academic
institution to do, write software to scan particular
documents for patterns or using techniques for
research.

MR. PRIEBE: Okay. I think specific to
the future digital system, one of the things that is
a core underlying function of that system is to be
able to deliver content in formats that the end user
requires.

So, you know, specific to those various
formats, I think that's part of the requirements and
certainly key to the development for the success of
the system.

MS. PARKER: Marian.

On assumption number six, it says that
libraries would need to ensure that they are
providing access to the same version of the digital
publication as I'm assuming that means currently as
of the date they're getting the publication from
GPO.

So my question is are you all planning
to develop some ability to push out a new version or
a new edition or a new whatever every time something
comes out or is there some automatic update
capability built into a document like this that
would go back and check against the GPO holdings to
see, you know, once somebody pulls it up that they
need to go get an update?

MR. PRIEBE: Well that's definitely a
good how question. As far as, you know, how the
inter-workings of FDsys plays out is something I
don't know at this point that we can really
reaffirm. And let me feel free to introduce a
couple of other folks that worked with me on this,
Gil Baldwin and Robin Haun-Mohamed and between the
three of us or others from GPO, we'll, we'll answer
what we can when it's definitive.

But I think specific to, you know, the
version of a specific product and how it's pushed
out, that's really part of --

MS. PARKER: Let me rephrase that then
because I actually meant to ask a policy question,
now a how it's going to be implemented question.

So as a policy, are you going, are you
planning to create an ability for the library or the
user to automatically know and be able to obtain the
most current version or is it going to be as it
seems to me to read here, the actual responsibility
of the library or the end user to check every single
time to see if there's something more current?

MR. PRIEBE: Well, the policy decision
certainly hasn't been made but, you know, whether
it's an automated push for a specific type of
content that a depository library selects and has
pushed to them, if that is a one-time thing or if
it's a request that's made, it really I think is
going to depend on the end user in terms of how
that's distributed. If it's automated or if it's a
manual update process where, you know, via a catalog
record or some other means. Good question.

MR. DAVIS: This is Ric Davis from GPO.

Just want to add to that in developing
the requirements for the future digital system, we
built in the capability as many of you have read for
significant version control and part of what we
envision is being able to push this information out
based on user profiles and things of that nature
that are set up. So the capability is certainly
I think that the next step is as the CTO office and GPO are working with the Harris team in implementation is to figure out from a policy standpoint how we go about implementing that.

MS. PARKER: That helps a lot and I did miss that detail, so thank you, Ric.

MR. PRIEBE: Ann.

MS. MILLER: Yeah, I, I have a question. I mean one thing I would like to express is that some of us actually want to track all the versions, you know, the bills change over time and we don't want just the new one and I know that's not really what Marian was getting at.

My question is on assumption number three, can you describe what you mean by preservation partners?

MR. PRIEBE: Okay.

MRS. RUSSELL: We obviously are designing a system that will have significant redundancies for protection of the content and we are active participants in the so-called COOP, the Continuity of Operations for the National Archives and for the
Congress and so in addition to the normal kinds of redundancies, we have redundancies in order to support them in their need to continue to access and produce content. So, we have lots going on within the Federal system and then our partnership with NARA and, you know, it goes from there. But, but we also are considering how to have external non-Governmental sets of information and that might be done through other organizations such as Open Content Alliance or Portico or organizations like that, it might be done through partnerships with people in the depository program where individual institutions wanted to take responsibility for being the back-up archival site for certain parts of the content. I don't know how likely it is that there's any one institution that would want to take on the financial burden and the logistics burden of being a full back-up. So, I don't think we have an answer to that and we know, we know that we need to look beyond the Governmental redundancies to other as yet
undetermined partnerships. Is that, okay.

MR. PRIEBE: And I think one of the
things you'll hear more about as GPO's future
digital system is actually in the implementation
stage of specific preservation functions and how
many redundancies are there and what they are and
that's going to give the community a better
understanding of where GPO is and how to respond in
addition to that.

MR. WARNICK: This is Walt Warnick from
the Department of Energy.

Assumption number two talks about the
need for new, more flexible guidelines for managing
digital publications and certainly I think it's hard
to disagree with that assumption.

Specifically we note that the
flexible -- the future digital system is supposed to
be inaugurated August 31st of 2007 and it presumes
that agencies are going to provide metadata with
items they submit, so I would certainly encourage
the guidelines for that metadata be made known to
the agencies well in advance of the August 31st
date.
MR. SUDDUTH: And this is Bill Sudduth.

And I look at that phrase and see something different in that we're going to need new guidelines, but the word flexible makes me uncomfortable in that how can we know that at this point as you develop new guidelines because as you get down in five and six, you can't be but so flexible when you talk about five or six.

So flexible makes me uncomfortable in that it creates, it may be creating an assumption that there is, there's lots of possibilities, but as the system gets developed, it's going to start out fairly fixed and that there might be flexibility.

So, I, I, you know, I wouldn't want to, you know, two years from now hear someone stand up and say, but you said it's going to be flexible which means I get to do this. Okay.

MR. PRIEBE: Right, and I think that also speaks to the issue of releases of the future digital system when we talk about that first public release 1C versus releases 2 and 3 where there's that enhanced functionality that some of that flexibility is, is really in terms of evolving on
the functionality of the system and as it's more functional and there's no features and adaptability, that's going to enhance that flexibility issue.  

MS. STIERHOLZ: Can I just ask a clarifying question on six. When you say that libraries would need to ensure they are providing access to the same versions of a digital pub, is that all the same versions or just the same versions that they need? In other words, do you mean the same document or all the versions of that document?

MR. PRIEBE: All the iterations of it, is that the question?

MS. STIERHOLZ: Uh-huh, right.

MR. PRIEBE: Yeah, well, I think where we were going with this assumption specifically was, you know, the most current version that is available through GPO would, the libraries would need to have that accessible.

MS. STIERHOLZ: So I'm just thinking of the old model where people could stop receiving things and have essentially a collection of superseded materials which they held on their
shelves and theoretically hopefully informed patrons
that these materials were superseded.

This would not allow that, then; is that
correct, this assumption?

MRS. RUSSELL: I think this is part of
where we're needing to do a lot more exploration,
but if you think about it at the time that we first
distribute a publication, it has not yet been
superseded.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Right.

MRS. RUSSELL: So there's no linking it
to a more current version and if at a later time you
stop, you de-select and you stop taking that and we
later have a superseding version which may have a
link to the historical one and we refresh the
historical one to put a link to the more current
one, you now not only have a superseded publication,
but you have a superseded publication that doesn't
have the information about what supersedes it and
isn't, is probably not tagged as superseded.

This came up, for example, a very
concrete example with the Supreme Court. When they
issue a slip opinion, they supersede it. When they
issued a preliminary print and they supersede the
preliminary print and they release the final.

They have a concern about keeping the
permanent public access to the slip opinions and the
preliminaries when they've been superseded unless we
in some way mark those as superseded and point the
person to the right version.

So, we're going to have to have
different mechanisms and policies and we don't quite
know how that's going to work yet, but that's part
of this issue that the digital is not the same as
the tangible and we may have different
responsibilities.

So, I think this is more addressing the
fact that we know in general that we're going to
have to address this, but not, again, not so much
how are we going to address it.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Right. And addressing
it I totally think yes, we want to do that. But I
can see how this could get really complicated.

MRS. RUSSELL: Yeah, it will get
incredibly complicated.

MR. PRIEBE: Tim, did you have --
 MR. BYRNE: Tim Byrne.

Yeah, I think that the assumption two that really says we have to have new guidelines for this stuff really affects five and six. We're looking at five and six and trying to apply the old guidelines with things that we understand to that, you know, we're working with tangible things is not going to be that case and it's really hard to think how this will be because we don't have any experience with this. But we can guarantee it will be different and we will have to have something, you know, different guidelines.

MR. PRIEBE: Absolutely right. Yes.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

With regard to all of the assumptions, I notice that everything is, is kind of lumped together and my experience has been that you may need to deliver different levels of information. For example, some people may only want metadata, some people may only want cross-reference information, some people may only want, may want the whole thing.

MR. PRIEBE: Right, and I think we are
in tune to that in terms of the flexibility of the system and what it has to have to enable that, you know, metadata as well as content.

Anything else from Council? Okay, is there anything from the audience before we go into the questions?

MR. MEYERS: Larry Meyers, San Bernardino County Law Library. And Ann and Katrina kind of hit on what I was going to bring up. Is there an underlying assumption or should there be an assumption or should one of the assumptions incorporate the assumption that where appropriate, the previous versions of an item will also be kept within the system? For example, legislation, old, you know, previous years of the CFR, things of that nature?

MRS. RUSSELL: And I, that is definitely an assumption for the permanent collection at GPO, but again, it goes back to as a community we're going to have to re-frame the assumptions about what the responsibilities are of regionals and the selectives who take this on deposit.

MS. MILLER: Well, and this might
follow-up, this is Ann Miller again, where Pete was
talking about, somewhat of an ability to kind of
taper the flow from the fire hose and that there are
just a few of us probably who are, you know,
interested in for -- instance, the one I always
think of is the, the lists of members of Government
from all the Governments in the world from the CIA
and I want that, I want every single issue of that
because my researchers are going to use it. But,
you know, Larry's aren't going to need that and he
won't want it, so.

MR. PRIEBE: Yes, go ahead.

MR. MORRISON: Hi, I'm Dave Morrison
from the University of Utah, Marriott Library.

And regarding the assumption number six
that libraries would need ensure that they are
providing access to the same version of a digital
publication.

I, I think it would be really helpful if
it were the system that is, is making sure that it
is continually the most up-to-date version so that
it does not require any kind of manual intervention.

There's nothing quite as frustrating as pointing
someone towards a, something that I have created in
the past or whatever and just and realizing, oh,
that doesn't have the most up-to-date information
and it's because I needed to go and actually
manually change it and I just didn't get around to
it.

So, thinking about this, it's almost
like thinking of instead of this being a document,
thinking of it as more of like a portal or a
pipeline which is showing the current version of the
information most up to date and maybe then if people
wanted to save it, what is being shown at a given
time, at that point then it gets all of the, it
turns into a static document with the metadata that
would say at this point in time when you sliced it
off and preserved it, this is the metadata for it
and this is the stuff that it's referring back to as
the earlier versions.

But it wouldn't be a document until you
actually tried to preserve it, a slice in time so to
speak. Just a way of thinking about it.

MR. PRIEBE: Sure, no.
MR. HEMPHILL: One follow up to that, one question about how automated you want this to be.

If you'll take the example of a delete transaction coming through, how automated do you want that to be?

MS. MILLER: And this is Ann Miller.

Another thing is is that I think we may -- if we're talking about digital deposits, this does mean that the library is taking responsibility and ownership for maintenance of this material, so that's basically what digital deposit is going to mean and if you, if this is not where we want to go, then we rely on the FDsys and its redundant systems to deliver us the information.

But I think one of the things that we need to be careful to dice is are we talking about ingesting electronic files into our libraries and maintaining them, full text, whatever, complete with metadata and being responsible for ensuring that they are the authoritative source, or are we talking about -- and we're not, we're not talking about pointing out to an off-site source that is
MAINTAINED AND REFRESHED BY GPO.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico. I know I keep hearing my mother in these assumptions because you know what happens when you assume, so perhaps maybe just an editorial comment there.

Number five, and this is kind of a follow-up to what David just asked. I'm kind of curious if you flushed out the sufficient infrastructure, the expectations from us as depositories and I'm also I guess a little concerned with the bandwidth and storage because I think some of us are grappling with how much storage we have available to us locally, how much we're going to need in the future.

And for any of us to plan on continuing, some of us need to be able to go to our respective administrations and say, well, over the course of the next year I need this, over the course of the next five years.

And I realize, again, we're just talking in somewhat very flexible idealistic terms here, but I was wondering if you've flushed any of these other...
MR. PRIEBE: I think specific to the future digital system, one of the things that the cross-functional team's been working on is really a system sizing document, to try to, you know, estimate or project some of the scope of volume that we have, those type of numbers, if you will, I think are really going to drive that whole issue of bandwidth as well as storage when you think of the scope of the entire system and what your specific institution's needs might be.

So that's a key, yeah.

MS. SMITH: Laurie Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.

Regarding number six, I would think one of the reasons we would want to have distributed digital copies would be in case GPO's copy gets corrupted. You know, if some master hacker gets in and changes the 42nd President to Daffy Duck, you would hopefully be able then to use one of our back-up files around the country to refresh yours.

So I think that would be one rare exception to us wanting to have the exact copy that
GPO has is if yours is somehow messed up.

And in terms of selectivity, I guess this would be number four, I think. I will in my library want to store some digital documents locally just to feel secure that we're in control of those, but I'm going to want some real, exceptional selectivity that I don't end up with digital files that aren't useful to my local people, as in the current distribution system we've always had to take other things, you know, in an item number and sort of had some trash build up in the collection along with the gems, I don't want to see that happen with the digital stuff.

So if there's some libraries that do want the things pushed to them, I think it would be nice if there was some option for those of us who want to be very selective to just be able to download specific files locally.

MR. PRIEBE: Yeah, understood, and I think that's a good point as far as the functionality of the system and what we need to continue to reflect on as it's developed.

Okay, well that was, let's go ahead and
Specific to access, and again this is to
Council, is the major goal of digital distribution
to improve public access to FDLP publications and if
so, how's that goal facilitated by libraries
providing local access to a digital copy?

MR. SWINDELLS: There's a lot in there,

improved public access, and I guess it depends how
we choose to interpret that. I don't think my

University would provide better bandwidth than GPO,

although we're working on that.

But one way of thinking about improved
public access is to make those digital objects work
better for my patrons to be combined with other
digital objects, to make composite objects, to make
special collections, like with State and local

materials.

And so that's one way that it would

improve public access for the folks in my State and

that's, that's mostly where I look at the improved

public access part of it.

MR. PRIEBE: Any other comments from
Council?

Tim.

MR. BYRNE: Yeah, I think we're doing things now in my library that I never dreamed up, you know, just a few years ago, not, you know, 20 years ago, but 5 years ago.

And I think that what we want to give ourselves is the potential to really develop new things, innovative things that that digital information gives us the capability to do.

MR. PRIEBE: I think those collections that you both have alluded to are an important point, re-purposing or creating, you know, innovative ways to service your customers.

MR. HEMPHILL: I guess one question I have is are you, is GPO planning on limiting digital distribution to just FDLPs or, say, if you have the corporate files, a Freedom of Information Act request for information, would GPO be providing that information to that company?

MR. PRIEBE: Well, felt a little bit like a big how, but, you know, specific to the system and again, what our mission is to provide
free and open access to content, you know, in terms of meeting the needs of the consumer or the user and the public, it's going to be a question of how that content could be presented and what format that they need.

MR. HEMPHILL: It's more of a policy question. Is GPO going to provide access?

MRS. RUSSELL: And, Pete, I, I think the answer to that is yet to be determined, but I will tell you how I've been thinking about it and that is, and we've been talking about this for, I don't know, since 1996 when we started talking about what would happen in this transition, we've been looking at what our services that we might have that are exclusive to depositories and that, therefore, provide a benefit to depositories.

And Ted started out by saying that we would be continuing to have what we have now; that is, anybody can come to the system and they can follow a PURL in the catalog and they can download a document or they can do a search on GPO Access and they can download a document.

They can go to the CGP right now and
they can E-mail themselves 20 cataloging records.

But I think there will be services, and I suspect
digital distribution is one of them and I think the
mass downloading of cataloging records or the
affirmative pushing of cataloging records to match
your profile is probably another where they will beexclusive. And that doesn't mean others can't get
to that same content, but that we don't have the
same partnership or obligation to be spoon-feeding
it, if you will.

So I think the example you gave in that
private sector firm, they can come to GPO Access or
FDsys or whatever its name turns out to be in its
next life and they can get the same content that the
depository could get, but I would expect that if
they wanted us to do that kind of service in
distribution, that would either be something
exclusive to depositories or it would be something
for which there was a fee.

So, I think there, there will be a
distinction between what our obligations are to
depositories and to the general public, not an
exclusion of content, but in the service.
MR. HEMPHILL: All right, thank you.

MR. PRIEBE: Okay. Should libraries receiving digital distribution be expected to offer a no fee, anonymous public access to local copies of FDLP digital publications and to minimize any restrictions such as user registration, location, et cetera?

MR. SWINDELLS: Emphatic yes.

MRS. RUSSELL: Then we get to the how, right. You get to do that how with your own local IT people.

MR. SUDDUTH: I'd, this is maybe a sinister question, but then doesn't that create the work-around that we just finished discussing? The potential?

MRS. RUSSELL: No, no.

MR. SUDDUTH: Okay, all right.

MR. PRIEBE: And the last one under this, should depository libraries take active steps such as including metadata in their catalog or developing appropriate Web pages to enable users to identify and link to FDLP digital publications in their collections?
MR. SWINDELLS: Hopefully not limited to catalogs, but.

MR. PRIEBE: Agreed. Okay, we're moving forward rapidly now.

Infrastructure, who determines sufficiency for local infrastructure to provide timely and effective public access? And then what are the criteria and should GPO develop those guidelines as they did for work stations.

MS. MILLER: I'll take a stab at part of it, this is Ann, from Duke. I, I kind of like the idea and way back, I'm dating myself, in the Chicago conference I was also one of the few people who said we need guidelines, I like guidelines because I go print them off or I can send them in an E-mail to my IT people and say, look, I need this, and then they can't argue.

So I'm all for -- the other thing is you know what this system is going to require and I need that advice.

Now, does that mean I will limit myself to only what's under the guidelines? No, if I can
get away with more, you know, I, I'll do my best.

MR. PRIEBE: Tim.

MR. BYRNE: I like guidelines, also.

Before GPO came out with their recommended guidelines, I was getting called by selectives asking, you know, what sort of equipment should they buy and I didn't really feel comfortable with that.

MR. PRIEBE: Okay. Marian.

MS. PARKER: Yeah, what I would say is make the guidelines minimal needs, you know, the very minimum that we need to actually function with what we're attempting to do, but as Ann said, then let us go for the gusto with our own people for more functionality for the, you know, for the future.

But if we don't know what the minimum, you know, what the minimal set-up is and we're all up there trying to figure it out and coming up with different things, we might end up not being able to provide adequate access.

MR. SUDDUTH: However, though, this is a case where the guidelines are going to have to -- any guidelines that are developed are going to have to assume a certain gradation or level of, you know,
because the systems will be of different sizes depending on how much information you take, what type of information you take.

So, it isn't going to be a lock-down, this is the type of machine that needs to be sitting on your desk. This is a, if you plan to take and manage this much stuff, this is how much you're going to need to take and manage this much stuff.

MR. SWINDELLS: I'm not sure if this is what Bill meant, but it, at least it sounds somewhat to me, right now the minimum guidelines are sort of you need equipment like this. When we look at digital deposit, I foresee them for as you need to be able to provide capacities that do this as opposed to a particular type, because we all have very different IT set-ups.

MS. DAVIS: I would recommend that you tell people, you know, the pipe size they need. Do I need a T3 or if I'm a public library and I'm connected to DSL, when are all my other PCs going to crash because I have two people downloading a 400-page document that happens to have a live video clip attached to it or high graphics.
MR. PRIEBE: That's a good point, yeah, when you think of video and the monstrous size of those files and what a depository may want, you know, that connection could be significantly different from just an occasional paper documents or standard content.

MR. SUDDUTH: It's not also a receipt and storage issue, it's a delivery back out issue which then becomes another gradation of how, how and to whom with what they have and how does that affect your delivery.

So, it gets even more complicated. If you take in from one, one pipe, and you can determine the size of the pipe, but when you're sending it back out, what glass are you pouring this back into depends on the type of glass that you've got to pour it back into and who you can and cannot pour it into.

MR. PRIEBE: I think it, there may be some libraries that really don't have the infrastructure, the, this would be the bandwidth and all of that, but if they have a policy to burn a copy on to a CD or a DVD and provide it to the
patron, they're meeting the patron's needs. So there's lots of ways that this can be delivered. Okay, you had a couple questions or comments.


I do think that you have to take into account with your guidelines like GPO does with their specifications now that many libraries and librarians need to take these specifications to higher levels than themselves, that they are taking them to IT departments. Some libraries, they are the IT department and they have to take them to directors who don't know all of the language.

So that there needs to be, like Bill was saying, a gradation of the specifications to take into account all of the types and sizes of libraries that FDLP enjoys. And most IT people that I've ever come across like guidelines, they want to know do I need this certain bandwidth, do I need this certain piece for this and potentially what is needed to not only take it in, but give it out.

MR. PRIEBE: Sure. No question.
MR. GOOCH: Just to kind of follow on that and also the idea of kind of the minimal level, I'm sorry, Mark Gooch, College of Wooster.

What level of specificity are you going to go to, you may have a T3 connection to your campus, but your networking folks may only allow you so much of that bandwidth for specific uses, so will we need to have specific amounts of bandwidth allocated within that big pipe?

MR. PRIEBE: Yeah, I mean certainly today I don't know that we could answer that, but the issues you bring forward certainly we're making note of.

MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver.

I think that the guidelines should include things such as naming conventions and file formats and directory structures.

For example, you don't want to be downloading Index at HTML and overwrite everything else or, you just, it needs to be some consideration.

MR. PRIEBE: Okay, very good.
Okay. Regional responsibilities. What are the responsibilities of regional depositories for the digital publications GPO distributes? Should they be required to accept and maintain all digital publications that GPO distributes and should regional depositories be allowed --

(Laughter)

The last one was should the regional depositories be allowed to accept digital content as an alternative to the print or microform version. Whole bunch.

Council?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Regionals first.

MR. PRIEBE: Regionals first, okay.

MR. HEMPHILL: I think 3AI there to a certain extent would be impractical and a waste of taxpayers' money.

I think you, if, if -- you need to be able to make sure that the library community is comfortable with the ability to preserve that information.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Yeah, Pete, I agree, I mean I just think that's not possible not just for
regionals, but for any library, except I mean that's
18 why GPO is there.
19 MR. BYRNE: I think this is something
20 that really scares a lot of regionals, terrifies
21 regionals. I think we've got regionals who are not
22 sure that they're going to be continuing as
23
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1 regionals and this is something that might actually
2 push them over the edge.
3 And the even, you know, that it's,
4 there's so much of it is unknown right now. We
5 don't have this experience with it, so it's really
6 hard to talk about what we're going to be in the
7 future when we don't really have any experience how
8 we're going to deal with these things and what we'll
9 be doing in the future.
10 So I hope we keep enough flexibility
11 with this area so that we don't lock us into
12 anything for regionals right now. Let us learn and
13 then make that decision.
14 MR. PRIEBE: Good comments.
15 MR. SUDDUTH: My question, though, is,
16 what if someone does and if they are or aren't a
17 regional, you have to be prepared for that
possibility?
I've heard folks stand up over the last several years and say possibly.

MS. MILLER: But my question to that it so what, I could be 100 percent selective now if I

wanted to be, I'm not that foolish, but --

MR. SWINDELLS: We actually don't have to answer this theoretical question because it says required to accept and maintain and so I would say for me the answer to the first is no.

The answer to the second is much more complicated and I don't, it's really a question of, it's really sort of back to essential titles and those kinds of questions. Should we be allowed to substitute? I think yes, but I also think within guidelines and that there will be some things where we are required to accept the print even if it's available in digital form.

MR. PRIEBE: That's a good point.

Richard.

MR. ACKEROYD: Richard Ackeroyd,

New Mexico State Library.

It's, I'm agreeing with just about
every, all the hesitation and the concerns that people are expressing, but it seems to me that sometime over the past year I've been involved in a couple of conversations where there was some discussion about the possibility of setting up a series of mirror sites around the country that regionals and depository libraries could access for the purposes of meeting their needs to provide access to their publics, without having to duplicate in every single library the kinds of things that are being suggested here and I think this goes all the way back to the access question in the beginning. So I don't know whether, is that, is that kind of discussion off the table or are you thinking about that or is the staff thinking about that as you're thinking about all of these questions, because it seems to me that could, could answer a lot of questions of access and ease of access and take a lot of pressure off a series of local IT infrastructures, particularly the smaller ones.

MR. PRIEBE: I say thanks for bringing it up, but yes, yes, we certainly are hearing that
and it needs to be factored in. Okay. Metadata, should GPO distribute bibliographic and other metadata as well as the digital publication. Yes?

(Many responded Yes.)

MR. PRIEBE: A lot of yeses there. What other metadata should be routinely distributed?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All that other stuff.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Anything you've got.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Anything you've got.

MR. PRIEBE: The kitchen sink should go out, is that --

MR. SUDDUTH: No, I mean I think, and I'm sitting here looking right at, whatever your name is.

MR. SWINDELLS: George.

MR. SUDDUTH: George. And there's already some idea of the different types of meta data that's needed. There may be others, but my
reaction is it's needed -- that kind of metadata is
going to be needed, particularly if you're going to
be flexible in your access to the information and
managing it.

Mr. SwinDELLS: Well, I have a slightly
different perspective on that. There's a prior
question here and that's what are we required to do
with the stuff? If we are saying that digital
deposit, and I don't think we are because I've
already discussed that, but if we are saying that
it's preservation over time, then that's another
whole set of metadata elements that we want
distributed.

If we are simply saying that as trusted
repositories we can reliably say that this is what
we received and it has not been altered, which is
essentially what we do now with print, then that's a
different set of metadata.

So it isn't necessarily everything. It
depends what we're doing with the stuff.

Ms. Miller: This is Ann.

I just have a quick -- I just think that
in some ways, I'm trying to balance what I might see
a library doing with the digital,

digitally-deposited material, if it's a truly creative enterprise and they're going to take it out and they're going to make something wonderful out of it, then they need to be the ones who are going to decide what metadata is appropriate and what isn't, because that's where they're going to need the file structure and the preservation information, et cetera.

But then there might be others of us who are interested in primarily just having a certain set of products that, that meet the needs of our particular mission and don't, probably won't spend a lot of time, you know, noodling around with it.

Is that, the question I have is that GPO's responsibility to make that decision or should GPO be delivering us everything and then we go in and say, you know, we're going to strip these sections, we don't need the METS stuff or we don't need the MODS stuff or one of those M things, we're going to strip it all out?

MR. SUDDUTH: So you're saying would it be part of like a profile delivery? Okay.
MR. HEMPHILL: Well, one consideration you have to have in there and this goes back to delivering different levels of information, is to what extent is GPO going to require certain meta data for synchronization of information, for example, version control.

You need to consider what's going to be necessary to make things basically functional to make sure things stay up to date.

MR. BYRNE: Once upon a time our library was part of the group that had used the Carl system and the people who developed this system, they were really brilliant people, very forward-thinking people, but for some reason, to save space on their servers, I don't really remember what it was, they decided they didn't need to retain all of the bibliographic record. They could strip out all the XXDLs, and this was a mistake and they came to realize it later and had to do, you know, an incredible re-indexing and re-loading.

But I think it's a mistake not to let us have everything that we might use sometime in the
future.

MR. SWINDELLS: I guess I'll change what I said before because I agree with both Tim and Ann. It's really about what should be accessible. Everything should be accessible to us and we should be able to take what we need from that, but.

MR. PRIEBE: Selectivity. When can a selective library or regional select only the digital version of the publication? I think this came forward earlier, as well, and are there exceptions?

MS. STIERHOLZ: I think any time they want, and I assume that they would always do this, to serve their customers the best, so, and I think libraries do have their users in mind and so they're going to select the thing that best serves their user. I can't think of any exceptions.

Regionals well you guys -- I'm not going to.

MR. PRIEBE: Version issues and synchronization, if a library no longer selects similar publications, will it need to manage its collection to ensure that it is not providing access
to a superseded version? And if yes, how could this be accomplished? I think that was a topic we were on earlier, as well.

Additional comments?

MR. HEMPHILL: I think the answer to A is yes and, if yes, answer to A is yes and if yes, how could this be accomplished.

Magic.

(Laughter).

MR. PRIEBE: Well that is the system, a magic wand is going to make it happen.

MS. MILLER: This is, this is Ann. I, I know I harp a little bit about this, but I actually find, you know, I work in a research library with a lot of nerds and they ask for this kind of really old stuff. I want to know how it developed over the last 30 years, I'm like okay, whatever.

But I think, we manage our collection to ensure that we are at -- providing access to the appropriate version for what the person is using it for, and sometimes it's appropriate for our users in certain times to look at superseded versions and
that's important.  

MR. HEMPHILL: My colleague, Evelyn, brought up an interesting point.  

MS. MILLER: She's pointing at me.  

MR. HEMPHILL: And mentioned that de-selection might be a piece of functionality that's needed for FDLPs.  

MS. FRANGAKIS: But I also have a question for Ann in when your patrons are looking at the superseded versions, are they aware that they are superseded versions so that, that would need to be an issue in the digital environment as well, if those continue to be available.  

MS. MILLER: That's correct, I think it's important that we market appropriately; however, we do that in an electronic environment because I, you know, if there, if they're wanting to look at the development of the Medicaid rules, God knows why, they might want, you know, they, certainly if they are a practicing physician and they want to know what their reimbursement rate is going to be, they want to look at what's current. Believe me, that's hard to find.
But they want to, you know, look at, they might want, our researchers might want to look at the old stuff.

MR. PRIEBE: Richard.

MR. ACKEROYD: Richard Ackeroyd, New Mexico State Library.

It seems to me that this might be similar to tracking a legislative history and as you do that, Bills get amended and put forward and line itemed and whatever and I wonder if however legislative histories are being tracked now couldn't serve as a model for dealing with superseded versions of other kinds of publications.

MR. HEMPHILL: With regard to the how, we struggled with, with doing that, keeping things in sync and one thing we provided to our external partners was software that allowed every time that a user viewed the information about the content, i.e., the actual document, that it would go back to a centralized server if it was available and validated, that is a current version. If it's not a current version, it would pop up a dialogue box and say this is not a current version, please download
In addition, we had situations where we put expiration capability on there and also if there was off-line use like for in submarines or people who are on aircraft, we would warn them that this may not be the current version and they should validate it with, with the authenticating source.

MR. PRIEBE: Kind of like what we've talked about with authentication and digital signatures and provided online access and so forth and so on.

Yeah. Yeah.

MS. WEST: Amy West, University of Minnesota.

I just double checked with somebody who works in a selective library to make sure this is right, that if you decide not to continue selecting a prints or micro form publication, that's okay, that's just the last issue you have.

There's a number of ways you could differentiate one version from another. Technically that's not that difficult, you can find date stamps and incorporate them into something visual. So I
would be inclined to say no, if a library decides to stop selecting something at a certain point, why should that be conceptually different than if they did so with print.

MR. PRIEBE: Thank you.

Barbie.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

It's sort of, it seems like it could go back to the metadata, I mean it obviously would be a metadata piece that would talk about this. And I guess the thing with metadata, you might think at some point you wanted only X metadata but then later you might want more metadata to go with that same document, so it's sort of maybe needs to be modular so you could grab more metadata to match up with your materials that you have stored locally later on.

MR. PRIEBE: Good point.

Okay, on to ownership. Do digital publications distributed under the aegis of the FDLP remain the property of the U.S. Government, including back-up and other copies maintained on
library systems?

What are the implications of an agency requesting the recall of FDLP electronic titles?

And one more, if an agency does not want older issues to remain available online, how should this be handled?

A couple good topics for us.

MS. SELBY: It seems like the first one violates copyright law, that if somebody makes a copy of a digital Government publication on their own server, since there is no copyright in the public domain, they own it.

I don't know, that's how I see it. Is there some other way of looking at that?

MRS. RUSSELL: I think in a strict copyright sense you're correct. I mean anybody could go right now today on GPO Access and download any document and, you know, there's no ownership issue.

I think the ownership issue and maybe ownership isn't the right word for it, but more comes in what is your commitment by being a partner in the FDLP.
One of the things you agreed to as a depository with respect to the tangible materials is that this is property of the Federal Government, that you will honor recalls. We then try to be extraordinarily scrupulous about what is allowed to be recalled so that it isn't a frivolous process, but there are times when something completely inappropriate, for whatever reason, gets sent out there.

I mean we're finding old stuff now with social security numbers in it which at the time people didn't think too much about, but boy now that it's all automated, people can, people say wait, wait. I mean that's in the tangible stuff, but if you think about the inadvertent distribution of an inappropriate document, I think it may be more of what is your commitment as a depository library to honor, I mean that's more maybe going to be.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay. So that's your concern with this, not, you know, somebody leaves the program, you are going to request all these digital documents back?

MRS. RUSSELL: No.
MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay.

MR. HEMPHILL: Much of the, much of this has been discussed widely with the implementation in private industry of sarbanksoxly (phonetic spelling), what issues of retention of E-mail, retention of documents, retention of back-ups. You might want to consider looking at some of the work that's been done in that area as ground-breaking work and potentially be able to implement policies similar to that of what's been implemented for sarbanksoxly.

MR. PRIEBE: Anything else from Council? Oh, Tim.

MR. BYRNE: I'm concerned about what is not being asked at this point and it's something I was expecting to be here and that was a retention rule, five-year retention rule. Should there be a five-year retention rule for the electronic publications? And I happen to think no is why I sort of hesitated to bring it up.

MR. PRIEBE: No, that's a good question. I think we had about five pages of questions that we really scaled back over time. And I mean that's
certainly a relevant one, as well.

MR. BYRNE: But I think this is, it's linked to the ownership, too, so if we're saying it is owned by the -- and that could come up.

MRS. RUSSELL: And I think the basis for the five-year retention rule in statute is heavily based in Federal property and it's based on the concept that if we've spent scarce appropriated funds to print and ship this copy to you, you should not the day after tomorrow throw it away and that, you know, that, that an investment has been made and clearly there's a different kind of investment at a cost for transferring electrons. It's not that there's no cost at all.

I mean it's no free lunch, but it is a very different thing and we aren't really dealing with tangible property.

MR. BYRNE: You know, in anticipation of that, I actually went back and read the legislative history and everything, so I'm glad to hear you say that.

MS. MILLER: This is Ann.

I, however, disagree. Well I think, I
think some of it, and it may not be in quite the
same form in this, in this world, but I think we
need to get somehow to, if we're going, if a library
is going to request digital deposit, we need to have
some method of ensuring commitment I think is the
right words for me. If, if we are, if they are
taking delivery of this material, I want to be sure
that it's not just sort of going on a server
somewhere and hiding.

I mean you can argue what difference
does it make, it's just taking up server space. But
GPO has paid for distributing it and I think they've
made a commitment, or they would make a commitment
on their end to deliver this and that somehow we
have to come up with a way for the receiving
library, and I think we address it in certain of the
other questions, but there needs to be a way for the
Federal Government to ensure that the receiving
library is upholding its end of the bargain and
that's what we've had with the five-year rule in
terms of property.

MR. BYRNE: On the other hand, this is
not point -- this is not information that's not
available then. This is still stuff that's available through GPO, through the links in their catalog, so the depository will still be able to provide access, even if they may have the intent some day to do something with these things and they're sticking them on a server where nothing is happening right now.

MRS. RUSSELL: And I think, though, that Ann has hit on a point which was part of what I think was underlying some of our assumptions, which was we're not just distributing these things to people to store away with the idea that maybe 10 years from now you're going to do something with it, that, that there is some level of commitment to public access and to having the infrastructure. And again, with them doing something with it and all of those things I think are things about which there's going to need to be a lot of dialogue to define, you know, not just what are the minimum technical requirements, but what are the minimum commitments that need to be made and I think we're just at the very early stages of feeling our way into that.

So I think kind of both points have
their merit, that we are not going to use property-based logic to make these decisions, but we are probably going to make decisions based more on, you know, why are we expending the resources to develop and manage a system to push this content to you if you're really not using it for public access, which is that for which we are being funded to do these, these tasks.

So, but I, I think it has also been a tie back to the B and C parts which may be much harder. I mean once the horse is out of the barn, it's not much use locking it. And given the ability for people to back up Websites and do all these other kinds of things, you know, recalling a digital publication once it's been posted on an agency Website for a while is an exercise in futility. That doesn't mean that agencies still don't when they find an oops, particularly a significant one, feel compelled to try to deal with it and be given our special relationship with them and your special relationship with us, it's something we need to be talking about, thinking about, should we do it, how should we do it, if not and we disclose it to
agencies that we're not doing it, does that affect their willingness to put the stuff into the pipeline to get it into FDsys because they know if they make a mistake. It's irrecoverable.

So, some interesting issues as yet to be resolved.

MR. SWINDELLS: The five-year rule, though, also it's not simply a property commitment. It is a commitment to service.

MRS. RUSSELL: Right. Yes.

MR. SWINDELLS: This is a particular area represented by that material and so you are making a service commitment. And whether we retain a five-year rule or not, we need to retain a certain amount of continuity in service commitments.

MR. PRIEBE: Very patient. Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Sure. Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University and I've got to get myself to a shorter named college.

The digital files that we would choose or have downloaded for us, I'm happy to keep those five years if you want me to. I'm happy to take them off the server if the agency asks us to, but if
I'm running out of server space and I need to weed
or, you know, weed my collection, I would really
like to not have to create an exchange list and
seek -- if we can skip that part, that would be
great.

MRS. RUSSELL: I have a feeling we can
probably all agree to that, other access copies.

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

And part of it is, you know, I'm kind of
torn. We have a huge history based on tangible, yet
we are totally discarding that going oh, this is
totally new, you know. Ah, yes, I really want A to
be required because I want to shift back to Judy the
bits and bites, the on and off for electronic
product back to GPO. After all, they distributed it
down to us, I need to send those electrons back.

Come on. I think what Geoff was getting
at was part of it. What was, what were we trying to
accomplish by which we did all of those rules for,
you know, you have to have your aisle space XY to
get at your tangible product and you had to have
light and you had to have photocopying and you had
to have this and that. We didn't develop those
guidelines as a whim. They were meant to accomplish
something.

What are we trying to accomplish with
digital distribution and what are the requirements
that we have implied in a tangible world that apply
and we can use before we re-invent going, oh, it's
totally different.

No, meeting an end user's need, whether
it is intangible, may have a different set of
specifics, but you still need to what are we trying
to do with our general public.

And so I, you know, I'm always kind of
torn going, yeah, we really want that, but yeah,
it's really stupid to send back the electrons to
Washington. The last one, you know, again, part of
me goes I don't care what the agency wants, you know
if I bought it, it's mine, okay. But you
distributed it, so it's GPO's, you know. And I hate
to get a thing here going, how many have made copies
of the stuff before we sent it back, or we destroyed
it.

I mean we are not --
MRS. RUSSELL: And believe me, we tell them whenever these discussions occur that we can pretty much guarantee them that somebody, you know, and if it were tangible and somebody has already digitized it --

MR. HAYES: Bingo.

MRS. RUSSELL: -- will be posting it shortly that they, that they, even so in the tangible environment we have a lot of conversations about that.

And, yet, I think we can all agree that there are instances where there are appropriate reasons for a recall and there are going to be instances as we go back and digitize historical collections that we're going to unearth documents which at the time in a tangible format were distributed but in an electronic format, the fact that it's a directory which has the social security numbers of everybody who was in it, you know, we're going to have to have a way to redact or, you know, or if something like that got out, we're going to have to have a way to, and recall may be a euphemism, it's really erase.
But, you know, I mean it is part of that whole what is the relationship we have and you have through us with these publishing agencies that cause them to voluntarily participate. I mean if we're scraping it off their Website, you know, they've made, they put it out there. If the horse left the barn, the horse left the barn.

But if we're asking them to affirmatively deposit it in order to give it to you, again there is some expectation that if there's an oops, that, you know, we and you aren't going to just say oh, too bad guys, you just published the social security numbers for everybody that receives Veteran's benefits and we're keeping it, you know, I mean, so.

MR. HAYES: Right. And I think we do that, but again, it's what are we trying to accomplish, but how far retrospective do we go. You know, I'm in an institution that, you know, I could be weeding my collection against policy every time the Catholic church comes up with a new, oh, well let's weed that out because it's against policy.

So it is, again, but my main point was
can we be doing this in terms of what do we already have in place, is there really valid reasoning that is totally different in an electronic era instead of going yeah, we built on it for this, we'll do a similar kind of infrastructure to meet the needs with an electronic one.

MS. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question based on the five-year rule with electronic, underlying the whole issue. If for a small depository, if our item number is whatever, if there's an electronic document that goes to that item number, access -- we can give access by having Gov., you know, linking to Government Websites.

From what you're saying, it sounds like we are needing to have those into our catalogs because it, we have the item number. Maybe I'm misunderstanding what you're saying, but it sounds like we're being required with the five-year rule to have access other than sort of the piece of paper in hand idea.

MRS. RUSSELL: I think I understand what you're saying and I think we've been having a number of conversations going back to when I was at GPO
before about the whole issue of digital deposit. I don't think we're expecting to require anybody to take digital deposit, I believe we even asked that question about the regionals, you know, I, I think it's more if we offer the option and we are expecting to have the capability to do that, so in, in the case of a selective that simply wants to provide access and doesn't want to house any of those on a digital deposit, I don't think we're going to be asking them to do that. I don't think we're asking you to change what you do in that regard.

I think this is an option. You can link to it to provide the access, you can download it to provide the access locally. To the extent that there's a tangible copy offered, you can select the tangible copy, you know, then it becomes another choice.

Does that kind of address what you were concerned about, or?

MS. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You were talking -- the question somebody raised about the five-year rule, how do we, if it's electronic only,
unless we pull all the records into our OPAC, how do we indicate that we are offering access to it to get rid of it in five years? That's sort of the circular loop that I'm having problems with here.

MRS. RUSSELL: Right. And there are and we did a show of hands on this in Seattle because we were talking about pushing of catalogs in records and other kinds of things, we don't require right now any library to download and catalog the digital materials as the way to link, although many, many of the libraries choose to do that.

And I think in most cases it isn't something where they would then systematically go back and weed because it's not a matter of the way you typically read tangible in terms of space savings and other kinds of things.

So, you're not required to have a cataloging record for something which you're merely supporting access to, but many, many libraries are choosing to do that and I don't know what your behavior is as leading. I suspect very few of you are going back and weeding cataloging records for electronic content. I mean is that a fair
assumption? I'm seeing a lot of heads nodding, so.

MS. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

MRS. RUSSELL: Does that help?

MR. PRIEBE: Okay.

Well I think we got through the
questions and if there's no other comments, I'll --
oh, okay, one more.

MS. ROWE: Beth Rowe, UNC, Chapel Hill.

I just wanted to let GPO know that I'm
very interested in direct deposit as a regional. I
have a director who as far as we're still in the
clouds is interested in the idea and an IT
department that has expressed interest.

So, I'm at a golden opportunity right
now. If you all are interested in any kind of a
pilot guinea pig situation, let me know.

MR. PRIEBE: Thank you.

MR. SUDDUTH: Anything else from
Council?

Seeing none, hearing none, I adjourn
this meeting of the Federal Depository Library
Council and the Depository Library Conference. A
remainder, though, that those of you who signed up
for tours, go, enjoy, and see you in Denver.

(Applause).

(Meeting adjourned).