# Recommendations of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer
# 1990 - 1994

# Recommendations of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer 1990-1994
## Table of Contents

## INTRODUCTION

This document presents the recommendations of the Depository Library Council from the Spring and Fall Meetings 1990–1994. The recommendations are presented in sections sorted by year, then further divided by spring and fall sessions. This document replaces the minutes previously found on the Web pages listed below.

**Please Note:** This document serves only as an archival record of what was previously published. Links referenced in this document may not exist, may be superseded, or changed.

### 1990

Spring Meeting:          http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp90.html

Fall Meeting:            http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa90.html

### 1991

Spring Meeting:          http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp91.html

Fall Meeting:            http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa91.html

### 1992

Spring Meeting:          http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp92.html

Fall Meeting:            http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa92.html

### 1993

Spring Meeting:          http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp93.html

Fall Meeting:            http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa93.html

### 1994

Spring Meeting:          http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp94.html

Fall Meeting:            http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa94.html

# 1990

# Depository Library Council Recommendations and Responses

## Spring Meeting, April 25-27, 1990 • Scottsdale, AZ

### Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council laments the fact that it is addressing the issue of the bound *Congressional Record* once again. Let there be no misunderstanding that we believe the *Congressional Record* is a vital part of the American political system and a unique historical record and is worthy of being preserved for the future; therefore Council recommends to the Public Printer that he request authority from the appropriate Congressional Committees to convert to microfiche the bound edition of the *Congressional Record*, Volumes 129 to 131 (1983-1985) and Volumes 132-135 (1986-1989) as soon as possible.

Council further recommends that GPO maintain both the paper and microfiche versions of the bound *Congressional Record* until such time as the CD-ROM version has been produced and evaluated for its effectiveness as a replacement for one or both of these formats. Council continues to believe that it is essential that GPO provide paper copies of the bound *Congressional Record* for distribution to all Regional Depositories, both for current research and archival purposes, and appreciates the Public Printer's efforts to accomplish this objective.

**Rationale:** The users of the 850 Depository Libraries that have selected the microfiche format continue to have no copy of this important title for the years 1983-1985, and this situation seems likely to continue for many months until a CD-ROM version is completed, released, and evaluated. In addition, as things currently stand, neither a paper nor a microfiche version will be produced for Depository Library distribution for the years 1986 and following.

### *Response*

A copy of this resolution was transmitted to the Joint Committee on Printing for their response. In a letter dated July 13, 1990, Senator Wendell Ford responded as follows:

> As you know, the Joint Committee has authorized GPO to proceed with the microfiching of the 1983 and 1984 bound *Congressional Records*. We anticipate that the 1985 edition of the bound *Record* will be available on CD-Rom in October of this year. Until we have had an opportunity to assess the results of the CD-Rom pilot project, the Joint Committee on Printing must withhold a final decision on whether or not to direct the microfiching of the 1985 edition. We hope that the CD-Rom format will meet with approval and acceptance by the user community.

> The Joint Committee has supported GPO's budget request to make available a paper version of the bound *Congressional Record* to depository libraries and at a minimum to regional facilities. We agree that for historical and preservation purposes it is important that at least one paper set of the bound *Record* be available in each State.

### Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council recommends that the GPO submit a proposal to the Supreme Court of the United States to become a subscriber to their new pilot project to disseminate electronic text of Supreme Court opinions.

**Rationale:** The Supreme Court is soliciting proposals from organizations in the "business of disseminating information" that will provide the "widest dissemination of the Court's opinions." Making this information available to the Depository Libraries electronically via GPO will assure broad public access to basic government information on an equitable basis to those participating libraries electing to download this data.

*Response*

GPO submitted a proposal to the Supreme Court and was notified on June 12, 1990 that it had been awarded a subscription. GPO will provide electronic access to Supreme Court opinions using a bulletin board system. The files will be available in ASCII format to libraries dialing in at 300, 1200, 2400 and 9600 baud. The system will be open to any of the 1400 depositories electing to access it; libraries will be responsible for the local software to postprocess the downloaded information, as well as the telecommunications costs.

## Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council recommends that the GPO actively work with the Council in developing survey questions to be included in the next "Biennial Survey of Depository Libraries" to collect costs of housing and operating a Federal depository document collection.

**Rationale:** Cost information is a necessary component in the process of long range planning. One effort begun by the American Library Association provides a starting point which can be used by GPO and the Council in the planning process. These statistics will complement the ALA benchmark data and will assist in the establishment of realistic goals and objectives for the future.

*Response*

GPO will be pleased to work with Council toward developing a survey aimed at identifying depository housing and operations costs. In order to ensure that survey results are as accurate as possible, GPO proposes that:

- the survey be administered to a statistically representative sample of the depository library community, enabling us to better administer the survey and more closely monitor the results;

- formulas be developed to facilitate and standardize the identification of overhead costs directly related to depository operations; and

- prior to the issuance of the actual survey, GPO will pre-test the survey and solicit feedback from the test sites.

## Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council requests that a report be prepared, and distributed to Council, that addresses the number and percentage of instances in which the claims were not filled due to insufficient copies.

**Rationale:** The data already provided by Library Programs Service and by individual Depositories indicate that an analysis of the data is needed to more fully understand the nature of the problem in order to identify appropriate corrective actions. The DLC was pleased by the statement by LPS staff in the Open Forum that this data was easily available.

*Response*

The following statistics on the number of unfilled claims were compiled from data entered into the Claims Processing System

 during the period from April 1, 1990 through June 30, 1990. Included are the number of titles distributed, the number of claims received and processed, and the percentage of unfilled claims. During the period, a total of 5401 titles were distributed. Of these, 405 (7.5%) were short of the quantity needed for distribution and could not be procured from the Documents Sales Service or the issuing agencies.

Month Title Copies Claims Claims Claims

Dist. Dist. Total Filled Unfilled

April 1,502 713,306 2,750 2,453 297

May 1,773 779,943 3,232 2,925 307

June 2,126 940,184 4,330 3,789 541

Total 5,401 2,433,433 10,312 9,167 1,145

During this three month period, LPS was unable to fill 11.1% of the claims which were received. The total number of claims received represented 0.42% of copies distributed. The number of unfilled claims as a percentage of copies distributed equals 0.047%.

## Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council recommends that key documents relating to the management and inspection of Depository Libraries, such as the "Manual", "Inspection Report" and the like, be made available to Council for review and comment prior to their publication.

**Rationale:** Such a review would assist GPO in anticipating potential problems with implementation of new procedures and policies.

### Response

GPO is committed to keeping Council involved in developing policies and procedures that are to be published in the "Guidelines for the Depository Library System" and the *Federal Depository Library Manual*. Insofar as these two publications are Council's products, GPO will continue to rely on Council to ensure that any potential problems with changes in procedures and policies are anticipated. Council will also be advised of major revisions in the Instructions to Depository Libraries and accompanying changes to the Inspection Form.

## Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer request that the Joint Committee on Printing include the following additional information in updating the next edition of *The Directory of U. S. Government Depository Libraries:* FAX telephone number and E-Mail contact/address. If feasible, the percent of depository items selected should be noted in an appropriate style.

**Rationale:** This information will make the directory more useful and improve communications.

### Response

This recommendation was transmitted to the Joint Committee on Printing. Senator Wendell Ford, in a letter dated July 13, 1990, responded:

> I am pleased to inform you that the Joint Committee on Printing has implemented the Council's recommendation that FAX and E-mail numbers be included in the next edition of the *Directory of Depository Libraries*. Accordingly, I have sent a letter to every Federal depository asking that they verify directory information and provide us with FAX and E-mail numbers if they wish to have them published.

## Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer communicate to the Bureau of the Census the absolute necessity for 1990 Census block-numbered maps for Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), as a minimum, to accompany the 1990 Census data. The Depository Library Community will be unable to provide satisfactory research services, including economic development, planning and the like, without this essential spatial data. We further urge that technical innovations be investigated (i.e. CD-ROM) to provide these maps in a convenient and useable format.

### *Response*

This recommendation was transmitted to the Bureau of the Census. The Director of the Bureau of the Census responded with a letter which is reproduced as Attachment A.

## Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service proceed with the abridged cataloging proposal for technical reports and non-depository publications. The abridged record should include the technical report numbers (fields 027 and 088) when available. The Council further recommends that GPO remain flexible in their implementation of abridged cataloging for the non-depository publications, taking into consideration any unique fields necessary to provide adequate access to these materials in an on-line catalog.

**Rationale:** While Council recognized the desirability of full cataloging for these materials, it concurs with GPO in the necessity to clear the cataloging backlog that presently exists.

### *Response*

As announced in *Administrative Notes*, Vol. 11, no 13, GPO has implemented abridged cataloging for the two lowest-priority categories of publications: technical reports and publications not distributed to depository libraries.

## Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council is deeply concerned about the numerous agency-produced CD-ROM products that are unavailable through the Depository Library Program and, therefore, recommends to the Public Printer that Library Programs Service should develop a list of these fugitive CD-ROMS for publication in Administrative Notes and, in addition, that GPO should more aggressively pursue these products for inclusion in the Depository Library Program.

### *Response*

GPO is developing a plan for raising the visibility of the Depository Library Program within the Federal government. The major thrust of our efforts vis-a-vis the publishing agencies will be to familiarize them with the Program in general and their obligations under Title 44, and to describe the benefits of dissemination through the Program. Pursuit of electronic products will be dealt with in the context of this overall effort, as an acquisitions issue.

In light of the existence of several directories of electronic products*, which include products of the Federal government, GPO does not believe that the benefits of maintaining and publishing lists of Federally produced CD-ROMs are commensurate with the level of effort such an undertaking would require. Therefore, at this time, LPS does not intend to undertake such a task.

However, LPS will attempt to keep abreast of lists and inventories being compiled by other organizations, and inform the depository library community of these efforts. For example, as part of the National Archives and Records Administration

(NARA) contract described in the response to Recommendation 15, the Archives will "identify and build an inventory of automated databases…" GPO will be actively involved in NARA study, and will ensure that the depository library community is kept apprised of the progress of the inventory.

* The following CD-ROM directories were reviewed in the Sept. 1, 1990 issue of *Library Journal* (vol. 115, no. 14, pp. 194 ff)

> *The Directory of Portable Databases*
> *CD-ROMs in Print 1990, an International Guide*
> *The CD-ROM Directory: 1990*
> *Optical Publishing Directory*

## Recommendation 11

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the GPO embrace the principles of the new "Guidelines for the Provision of Government Publications for Depository Library Distribution" and urges GPO to disseminate this document to the appropriate agencies.

### *Response*

GPO has endeavored to make widespread dissemination of the Guidelines document. On June 21, 1990, it was distributed to all printing and publishing officials of the Federal Government as "GPO Circular Letter 320". Copies have also been provided to members of the Public Printer's Interagency Council for Printing and Publications Services, and will be distributed to the Federal Publishers Committee. Additionally, the document will be used as a handout, as appropriate, for courses sponsored by the Institute for Federal Printing and Publishing, as well as being distributed by GPO staff on an ad hoc basis in the course of meeting with Agency officials.

## Recommendation 12

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO reprint and distribute the index to the 1989 *Periodical Supplement to the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications*.

**Rationale:** The GPO did not include the indexing for the Supplement in the 1989 cumulative indexes. By the time notification reached the libraries, some had already discarded the monthly and semi-annual indexes on the assumption that it was included in the cumulative index. To provide a replacement for the discarded indexes would give the paid subscribers and Depository Libraries the ability to provide access to the periodicals issued in 1989. It is standard practice for publishers who make a printing error of this severity to replace the defective product or offer some appropriate alternative to compensate the recipients.

### *Response*

GPO has reissued the 1989 Periodicals Supplement index in both paper and microfiche.

## Recommendation 13

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service investigate the costs and feasibility for implementing and maintaining an Electronic Bulletin Board (EBB) communication service. It is requested that the findings of this investigation be fully reported to Council at the October 1990 meeting.

**Rationale:** An Electronic Bulletin Board service will result in the following benefits:

- timely notice to Depository Libraries of urgent information, such as computer virus, cataloging/classification and publication alerts;

- reduction in costs, labor and miscommunication by replacing multiple telephone calls and/or mailings with one bulletin board message;

- provision of computer files, such as shipping list information or electronic court opinions; and

- assurance that messages are received promptly and at the convenience of the recipient.

### *Response*

GPO has formed a Task Force to investigate the cost, administrative and operational issues of implementing an electronic bulletin board. The findings of the Task Force will be presented to Council at the October 1990 meeting.

## Recommendation 14

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO join a universal access electronic mail service, such as Internet, to enable Depository Libraries which presently have or wish to obtain electronic mail (E-mail) capability to communicate interactively with one another and GPO.

**Rationale:** Increased interactive electronic communication among the Depository Libraries and between GPO and the Depositories will have the following benefits:

- reduces time lag for responses to inquiries;

- alleviates problems associated with time zone differences; and

- promotes more frequent communication, thus reducing problems by providing a mechanism to react quickly.

### *Response*

GPO will evaluate participating in a universal access electronic mail service in conjunction with the study described in the response to Recommendation 13.

## Recommendation 15

The Depository Library Council continues to be concerned with the preservation of the master copies of all CD-ROM disks distributed through the Depository Library Program. Therefore, Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO study the feasibility of obtaining the masters for future CD-ROMS and capability of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) to house them to meet archival standards.

**Rationale:** As with paper and microfiche formats, the Depository Library Council is concerned with archival preservation of government information in electronic formats. Storage of a duplicate CD-ROM disk is not adequate to ensure that data could be replicated or transferred to other media.

### *Response*

The National Archives and Records Administration has recently contracted with the National Academy of Public Administration for "A Study of Major Automated Databases Maintained by Agencies of the U. S. Government." (see Attachment B). GPO will be an active participant in this study. LPS's preliminary assessment of this study is that it will

significantly contribute to answering longstanding depository library community questions regarding archival preservation of information in electronic formats.

## Recommendation 16

The Depository Library Council supports the efforts of the Public Printer and the Joint Committee on Printing to ensure that the Library of Congress publications are distributed through the Depository Library Program. Council recommends that the Public Printer inform the Librarian of Congress about the deep concern of the Depository Community regarding the necessity for including LC publications in the Depository Library Program. Council further requests that the Joint Committee on Printing determine if the Library of Congress is in compliance with the provisions of Title 44 and, if they are not, to inform the Librarian of Congress.

**Rationale:** As a Congressional agency, the Library of Congress should be urged to participate in a joint distribution effort for LC publications. The Depository Library Program is a Congressionally mandated program and is the appropriate vehicle to make these government publications widely available to users.

### *Response*

This recommendation was referred to the Joint Committee on Printing. Senator Wendell Ford, in a letter dated July 13, 1990, responded:

> The Joint Committee shares the Council's concerns about the availability of Library of Congress publications to the depository library program. As you know, we have urged the Library of Congress to establish a Central Procurement and Printing Office to better facilitate their doing business with the Government Printing Office. Hopefully, actions taken by this Committee and GPO will improve the situation and result in greater communication between the two Agencies.

In addition, the Public Printer referred the question to the Librarian of Congress, who replied in part as follows:

> As you know, Library of Congress publications are available through the Depository Library Program. However, cooperative publications, which the Library of Congress produces with non-Federal participants and sells through its Cataloging Distribution Service, are excepted from the depository system through 44 *USC* 1903. Along with other government agencies, we also publish using gift and trust funds which the Library may receive through 2 *USC* 156-160. Occasionally issues arise over application of the depository requirements to these types of publications. A review of our past correspondence indicates that these issues have been worked out on a case by case basis to the mutual satisfaction of the Public Printer and the Librarian of Congress. I am confident that we will continue to do so.

**[The following two attachments did not scan well. Therefore, the text has been reproduced without the letterhead and actual signatures. Editor's note]**

**Attachment A**

AUG 13 1990

Mr. Robert W. Houk
Public Printer
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20401

Dear Mr. Houk:

Thank you for your letter advising us of the recommendations of the Depository Library Council regarding l990 census block-numbered maps.

The block-numbered maps from the l990 census will be available to anyone who has an interest in them, at the cost of reproduction. Typically, copies ordered from the Census Bureau will be shipped from one of the Census Bureau's regional offices within two weeks after the order is received. We are enclosing a report that describes the data and map products that will be available from the l990 census along with the procedure for how to obtain them (see pages 41, 42, and 45-47).

In addition to paper copies of the maps, the Census Bureau has announced, for more than two years, its plans to make its automated geographic files (the Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (TIGER) Files) available on both magnetic tape and compact disk-read only memory (CD-ROM). To date, the Census Bureau has released two nationwide versions of the TIGER/Line file, the second of which is on CD-ROM; two more versions are planned for release, one from August through October of this year and a second (also on CD-ROM) from January through March l99l. We have offered this product to the Government Printing Office to make available to the Federal Depository Libraries.

More than 50 commercial firms offer software to process the TIGER/Line files on computers ranging from microcomputers to mainframes.

The Census Bureau shares the Depository Library Council's interest in having its l990 census maps available in other formats as well, such as map images on CD-ROM. Staff has been working for the past 18 months to develop a suitable approach without success to date. If we are successful, this product also may be distributed through the Federal Depository Libraries System. Work is continuing to provide such a product that will permit even wider use of this new information by data analysts. We will announce this product for public sale as soon as we achieve satisfactory results.

We would be pleased to discuss the issue of the Census Bureau's map distribution plans in greater detail with the Depository Library Council or any of its members. They can direct their questions to Gerard Iannelli, Chief, Data User Services Division on (301) 763-5820.

We appreciate the interest of the Depository Library Council in the 1990 census, and also thank you for your interest and concern.

Sincerely,

Barbara Everitt Bryant
Director
Bureau of the Census
Enclosure

**Attachment B**

The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) has contracted with the National Academy of Public Administration (the Academy) for "A Study Of Major Automated Databases Maintained by Agencies of the U.S. Government." For purposes of this study, major databases are those which are used by Federal agencies in support of mission functions and which contain sufficient volume and detail of data to have value for use independently of the purposes they serve in the agencies.

The study will focus on the retention, availability and accessibility of valuable information which could support future historical research. It will identify and build an inventory of automated databases, and define a set of criteria for NARA's use in appraising electronic databases. The study will be carried out by a panel of experts in the data gathering activities of the Federal government, in two phases.

In Phase I, the Academy will survey Cabinet departments and major independent agencies to identify the large databases used by those organizations for programmatic functions such as regulatory and monitoring functions, entitlement and benefit programs, management of public resources, oversight and scientific and technical research. In conducting this survey, the Academy will make full use of existing inventories prepared by government or private sources.

At this time we wish to request your agency's support in carrying out this important project. Please notify Eric Minkoff at the Academy, telephone number 347-3190, no later than August 30, 1990, of your designated contact to work with the Academy staff. We would anticipate the need to meet with information resources management staffs, records managers, and data center directors as well as appropriate program staffs during the course of this study. We fully understand the time this type of project requires and will commit to keeping demands on your staff to a minimum.

Sincerely,

DON W. WILSON
Archivist of the United States

## A Study of Major Automated Databases Maintained by Agencies of the U. S. Government

The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) has contracted with the National Academy of Public "Administration (the Academy) for "A Study of Major Automated Databases Maintained by Agencies of the U.S. Government". For purposes of this study, major databases are those which are used by Federal agencies in support of mission functions and which contain sufficient volume and detail of data to have value for use independently of the purposes they serve in the agencies.

The study will focus on the retention, availability and accessibility of valuable information which could support future historical research. It will identify and review major automated databases and build an inventory for NARA's use in appraising electronic databases. The study will be carried out by a panel of experts in the data gathering activities of the Federal government, in two phases. In Phase 1, the Academy will survey Cabinet departments and major independent agencies to identify the large databases used by those organizations for programmatic functions such as defense, law enforcement, regulatory and monitoring functions, entitlement and benefit programs, management of public resources, oversight and scientific and technical research. In conducting this survey, the Academy will make full use of existing inventories prepared by government or private sources. A capture methodology will be developed to assist NARA in maintaining a current inventory over time.

The survey will be conducted through a series of briefings and meetings with Agency officials, structured interviews and a questionnaire designed to capture information on potential archival and long term research value of the databases.

Following the data collection efforts, the Panel will select a number of representative databases for further review in Phase II of the study. Selection of the databases for further review will be based on the specific fields covered, their potential for long term research value, their issuance in preservable single or multiple formats, their present usage, and their potential for containing historically significant information. An inventory of the major automated databases identified in the study will be provided to NARA in machine readable format at the completion of Phase I.

Phase II of the study is designed to provide long-term value criteria for use by NRA in determining through Federal databases which should be considered of archival value and important to long-term research. Working with professional associations, expert teams in specific fields will be identified to review the selected databases to ascertain:

- the range of potential uses of the information
- the need to retain the entire database or only portions of it to satisfy potential demands for research
- the feasibility and difficulty of transferring the data to the National Archives
- any problems associated with trying to establish intellectual control over the data or provide access to it
- requirements for the preservation, processing and provision of access to the data
- the cost of maintaining a capacity to preserve, process and provide access to the data

The expert groups will define a set of criteria for the evaluation of long term value of the selected, as well as future databases, and validate these criteria by applying them against the selected databases.

The expert groups will recommend a set of criteria to the Panel for its consideration before they are incorporated into a final report to NARA on the overall study.

### *ELECTRONIC DATABASES TO BE INCLUDED IN THE STUDY:*

Those in support of mission related functions of Federal agencies, such as defense, law enforcement, regulatory and monitoring functions, entitlement and benefit programs, management of public resources, oversight, and scientific and technical research.

Classified and restricted databases, but only unclassified descriptions and non-restricted information is to provided for the inventory.

Data collections of statistical agencies and other agencies whose missions are to compile and analyze information, such as social and economic censuses and surveys; monitoring of the public health; and scientific and technical reference data.

## *EXCLUSIONS TO THE ELECTRONIC DATABASE STUDY*

Housekeeping systems which support generic administrative functions such as

payroll
procurement and supply
property management
financial management, etc.

Bibliographic databases
Applications using ADP to monitor and track activities such as
casework
transaction processing
project management
correspondence tracking when the basic record of the activity being tracked is recorded elsewhere. Tracking systems may be included in the study if they are parts of larger ADP systems which are included.

Regular, systematic earth observation systems. (These are being covered separately by NARA.)

## *EXAMPLES OF CATEGORIES OF POTENTIALLY PERMANENT ELECTRONIC RECORDS*

Electronic records that replace records scheduled as permanent in another medium.

An example is the State Department's Automated Document System of Central Foreign Policy Files, consisting of both an index for locating documents and the text of telegrams, memorandums, and letters.

Automated indexes to permanent records.

Examples include the automated index to the Department of Interior's microfilmed records relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the automated index to the correspondence files of the Secretary of the Air Force, and an automated index to the records of the Presidential Commission on the Space Shuttle Challenger Accident.

Unique and important scientific and technical data resulting from controlled laboratory or field experiments.

Examples include data from the National Collaborative Perinatal Project, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health; and the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Pesticide Product information data.

Management data that have Government-wide coverage or significance.

Examples include the Office of Personnel Management's study of Whistleblowing and the Federal Employee, 1980, and Survey of the Senior Executive Service, 1981; the Equal Employment Opportunity Commissions' Equal Employment Opportunity Surveys; and the Federal Awards Assistance Data System (FAADS), which contains quarterly data about Federal assistance to state, county, and local governments.

Socioeconomic data on such topics as trade, education, health, or behavior

Examples include the Department of Education's National Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act, 1973-76; the Office of Economic Opportunity's study of Poverty Neighborhoods in 105 Large Central Cities, 1970; the Bureau of the Census' Annual Import and Export Data Banks, 1964-, Census of Agriculture, 1949-; and EPA's Population at Risk Systems, containing data related to pollution and health.

Natural Resources data related to land, water, minerals, or wildlife:

Examples include tlc Minerals Management Service's Mineral Availability System, containing types and locations of mineral deposits, and its Royalty Accounting Schedule, 1981; and the President's Commission on the Coal Industry's Survey of Community Conditions In Coal Producing Areas, 1979.

Data that document military or civilian operations during times of war, civil emergency, or natural disaster.

Examples include the President's Commission on tlc Accident at Three Mile Island's Study of Behavioral Effects, 1979; and the Joint Chiefs of Staffs Combat Activities File, containing data on flight operations flown in Southeast Asia from 1965 to 1970.

Political or Judicial data related to such topics as elections, special investigations, or court proceedings.

Examples are the Immigration and Naturalization Service's Naturalizations File, 1971-; and the Bureau of Justice Statistics' Census of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities.

Cartographic data used to map the earth's surface, other planetary bodies, or the atmosphere.

An example is the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Hydrographic Nautical Chart Data Base, 1970-.

National security and international relations data that document such activities as strategic or foreign policy assessments, foreign public opinion, or international negotiations.

An example is the United States Information Agency's General Population Surveys of International Political Issues, 1972-.

## *NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PANEL ON FEDERAL ELECTRONIC DATABASES*

**Chairperson:**
Ms. Elsa A. Porter
Management Consultant
Former Assistant Secretary of Commerce
1250 S. Washington Street
Suite 524
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. 703-548-2975

**Members:**

Mr. Ralph Carlone
Assistant Comptroller General for
Information Management and Technology
General Accounting Office

441 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20548
Tel. 202-275-4892

Mr. Sheldon Cohen
Morgan, Lewis & Bocklus
1800 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel. 202-467-7300

Mr. Joseph Coyne, Chairman
CENDI (Commerce, Energy, NASA, National
Library of Medicine, Defense Information Group)
Office of Scientific & Technical Information
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6207
Tel. 615-576-1188

Ms. Cynthia Kendall
Deputy Comptroller (IRM)
Department of Defense
The Pentagon, Rm 3E843
Washington, DC 20301-1100
Tel. 202-695-5679

Dr. Charles R. McClure, Professor
4-206, Center for Science and Technology
School of Information Studies
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13244
Tel. 315-443-2743

Dr. Janet Norwood, Commissioner
Bureau of Labor Statistics
U.S. Department of Labor
441 G Street, NW, Room 2106
Washington, DC 20212
Tel. 202-523-1092

Dr. Henry H. Perritt, Jr.
Professor of Law
Villanova University
Villanova, PA 19085

Tel. 215-645-7078

Mr. Francis Rourke
Professor

Department of Political Science
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD 21218
Tel. 301-338-7532

Ms. Judith Rowe
Computing & Information Technology
Computing Center
Princeton University
87 Prospect Avenue, Rm. 313
Princeton, NJ 08544
Tel. 609-258-6052

Mr. Michael Swift
Assistant National Archivist
National Archives of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A ON3

Mr. Gene Thorley
Asst. Division Chief for Coordination & Requirements
National Mapping Division
U.S. Geological Survey
Mail Stop 590
Reston, VA 22092
Tel. 703-648-5742

Ms. Katherine K. Wallman
Executive Director
Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics
1429 Duke Street, Suite 402
Alexandria, VA 22314-3402
Tel. 703-836-0404

Dr. Hal Winsborough
L & S Sociology
Social Science Building - Rm. 4462
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 63706
Tel. 608-262-2182

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*

# DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

## FALL MEETING, OCTOBER 24-26, 1990 • ARLINGTON, VA

## Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council is pleased with the draft report on the electronic bulletin board system. The Council urges immediate implementation of the bulletin board with electronic mail capability.

**Rationale:** An electronic bulletin board will be valuable for the distribution of information to the depository libraries, and also for communication among the GPO and its participating libraries.

### Response

The Government Printing Office (GPO) will implement the Federal Depository Library Program Bulletin Board (FDLP/BB) as soon as the requisite personnel and hardware resources are in place in the Library Programs Service (LPS). LPS has obtained the services of an employee with the technical expertise to implement the FDLP/BB on a pilot basis. LPS will then implement phase 1 of the FDLP/BB, consisting of downloadable program administrative information, and an interactive messaging capability. Phase 1 will operate on a dial-up basis, and the issues of telecommunications or network access will be investigated once LPS has gained familiarity with the regular operation of a bulletin board.

## Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council is pleased to learn that enhancements have been proposed to improve the lighted bin system at the Government Printing Office. In order to improve the sorting and delivery of documents, the Depository Library Council urges the Public Printer to approve funding for the implementation of these enhancements.

**Rationale:** The lighted bin system is integral to the distribution of documents to the Depository Library Program. Its aging hardware/software requires a continual and regular maintenance program.

### Response

The Library Programs Service (LPS) has long recognized the need for enhancing the Lighted Bin System (LBS) and requested funding to undertake system enhancements in fiscal year 1992. A major feature of the proposed enhancements is the detection and diagnosis of electromechanical problems in the system, in order to prevent situations like that which occurred in 1990 and again in early 1991 in which cross-wiring in the LBS resulted in libraries not receiving the publications which they had selected.

## Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council was interested to learn that GPO is preparing a 5-year cumulative index to the *Monthly Catalog* to be issued in microfiche. The Council recommends that the Public Printer investigate whether those indexes that have been issued in microform could be re-issued with a single cumulative index on CD-ROM, covering the years 1976-1990. As a further enhancement, the Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer consider whether the *Monthly Catalog* in its entirety could be converted to compact disk for the period July 1976 to the present, to continue on an ongoing monthly basis.

**Rationale:** The compact disk offers a single file to search instead of many paper issues; it offers more powerful search capability

and the ability to print out the results of a search.

## *Response*

The Library Programs Service has formed an agency-wide working group which will prepare a feasibility study and cost benefit analysis of five options for issuing and disseminating cataloging information. The group will examine the *Monthly Catalog* existing product line, consisting of paper, microfiche, and machine-readable tapes, as well as two potential alternatives: CD-ROM and an online service. Should this analysis result in a finding that CD-ROM best meets the objectives of the Government Printing Office, the depository library community, and end users, the group will make a recommendation concerning the possibility of issuing a CD-ROM *Monthly Catalog*. The working group intends to complete this analysis and its recommendations by September 30, 1991. Production of the 1986-1990 cumulative index in microfiche will be postponed pending the results of the study.

## Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council recommends that, where possible, files distributed in electronic products and services be in open architecture formats to 1) facilitate access through a variety of software packages, 2) encourage the development of new software to improve access, and 3) enable the recovery, downloading, and exchange of the original data for transfer to other media for further reprocessing.

The Council further recommends that the Public Printer appoint a Standards Committee to establish appropriate standards for the distribution of government data to depository libraries in readily accessible forms. Such standards should be incorporated into the "Agency Procedural Handbook for the Procurement of Commercial Printing Services". While we recognize that such standards might be different for different kinds of files, such as text or statistical data, a small number of basic standards would facilitate access. Such a committee should also identify appropriate freeware or shareware compatible with the accepted standards for the use of libraries which cannot afford or do not have more expensive commercial packages.

The Depository Library Council is concerned that, as more products become available in electronic products and services, they may be distributed in different incompatible formats. For example, some files may be produced in dBase III format while others may use different data structures requiring specialized software. If this occurs, it will not only generate additional expense for depository libraries, it will also create problems for librarians and users attempting to learn to use a variety of packages to access the information.

Freeware or shareware identified by the Standards Committee could be distributed via the electronic bulletin board or on floppy disk or imbedded directly on a compact disk.

## *Response*

GPO shares the concern of Council and depository libraries that government electronic products are currently being produced and distributed with inconsistencies, incompatibilities, and a variety of user interfaces. The CD-ROM industry and the federal government are attempting to ameliorate a number of these problems through the development of standards which will result in the production of CD-ROMs which can be accessed with any computer operating system, with any disc indexing structure, and with any compliant user interface.

GPO's manager of the Graphic Systems Development Division is a member of the government advisory panel tasked with improving a proposed CD-ROM data exchange standard, CD-RDx. The panel, commissioned by the Intelligence Community Staff, under the Director of Central Intelligence, is developing this standard to establish protocols that will enable universal interoperability of CD-ROMs. Universal interoperability would mean that CD-ROMs would become system and software independent. In terms of user interfaces, adoption of such a standard could mean that discs manufactured with the accepted protocols could be operated with the user's choice of any interface which had adopted the protocols. The final version of the

proposed standard is being readied for submission to the National Information Standards Administration (NISO) as a basis for establishment of an American National Standard.

However, although GPO is concerned about the usability of the products or services being disseminated through the Sales Program or the Depository Library Program, it does not have the authority to establish standards for federal publishers as a group. GPO's mission is one of providing production, procurement, and distribution services for information products of Congressional and federal agency publishers. It can and does advise these publishers about strategies for improving the quality and marketability of their products, but, ultimately, it is the decision of the publisher that determines the characteristics of the products which arrive in the depository library.

Libraries are urged to communicate their concerns about lack of standardization or lack of software directly to the publishing agency or to the appropriate working group within the Special Interest Group on CD-ROM Applications & Technology (SIGCAT). For information about SIGCAT, contact E.J. (Jerry) McFaul at the U.S. Geological Survey, 904 National Center, Reston, VA 22092-9998.

## Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council remains seriously concerned about the prospective elimination of the paper version of the bound *Congressional Record*. Although the Council applauds the development of the CD-ROM version of the *Record*, the Council believes that the *Record* has important historical and archival value to the nation. As a result, the Council urges strongly that the Public Printer work to retain the funds to continue to print and make the paper bound *Record* available to Regional Depository Libraries at a minimum and to fill any gaps between 1983 to the present that may have occurred due to lack of funding or for any other reason. Council still supports the production and dissemination of the microfiche version of the bound *Record* as stated in Recommendation #1 of the Spring 1990 Council recommendations.

### *Response*

Congress approved the distribution of the 1991 bound *Congressional Record* in paper format to 60 regional depository libraries and selected libraries in states without regional depositories. GPO will reprint and distribute paper copies of the bound *Congressional Record* for the years 1985 and later to those 60 libraries. Gaps in paper holdings from 1983-1984 will be filled for those 560 libraries selecting item number 0993 as soon as reprinting can be completed. Reprinting volumes from 1985 and later will begin soon. GPO has included funds for the continuation of paper distribution of the final *Congressional Record* as part of our Fiscal Year 1992 appropriations request.

In its July 13, 1990 letter to the Public Printer, JCP stated in part that it "must withhold a final decision whether or not to direct the microfiching of the 1985 edition" until they have had an opportunity to assess the results of the Congressional Record CD-ROM pilot project. GPO is awaiting JCP's direction regarding the feasibility of replacing the microfiche with CD-ROM or offering CD-ROM in addition to microfiche.

## Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service continue to offer print/microfiche publications for selection when corresponding electronic products or services become available.

**Rationale:** Council understands the equivalency/duplication between paper and microfiche. However, it does not accept a similar equivalency/duplication between those formats and electronic formats.

*Response*

GPO will take this recommendation into consideration as we develop policies for, and make decisions regarding, the formats in which Federal government information will be distributed through the Federal Depository Library Program.

## Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council regrets the continued non-compliance with the provisions of Title 44 by the Library of Congress and the Environmental Protection Agency. Council recommends that the Public Printer directly contact the Librarian of Congress and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the legal requirements for including their publications in the Depository Library Program.

**Rationale:** Reference is made to the response to Recommendation #16 (Spring Council 1990). The Depository Library Council finds it difficult to understand "... that these issues have been worked out on a case by case basis to the mutual satisfaction of the Public Printer and the Librarian of Congress" based on our knowledge of continued non-compliance. Council further believes that problems of non-compliance exist with the products and services from the Environmental Protection Agency and that the Depository Library Program would be significantly enhanced if both of these government entities followed the spirit and letter of the law.

*Response*

Letters transmitting this recommendation were sent to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Library of Congress (LC). See Attachment A for EPA's response. See Attachment B for LC's response.

## Recommendation 8

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer explore the means by which the forthcoming database of the Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, can be made available to the Depository Library Program and archived for public access.

**Rationale:** The Depository Library Council is concerned that the official documentary record of the Department of State, as reflected in *The Dispatch*, will only be available to the depository program in a selective paper form. Additional information from the Bureau of Public Affairs will be available only in electronic form through the private sector. The Council is concerned that this limited distribution of important government information may not meet the requirements of Title 44. Council urges the Public Printer to further investigate this Department of State database and vigorously pursue government information regardless of format.

*Response*

The provision of access to the database of the Department of State through the Federal Depository Library Program will not be considered in isolation from an overall policy regarding depository access to Federal online databases.

## Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council was pleased to learn that the Public Printer is engaged in a long term strategic plan for the Government Printing Office. The Council endorses this effort, offers its support and assistance and asks to be included in the review process relating to the Depository Library Program before final publication of the plan.

*Response*

The Public Printer is pleased with the support and assistance offered by the Depository Library Council. Being an essential advisory body to the Public Printer, as well as a vital stakeholder of the GPO, the Council will be involved in the review of the strategic plan, since its content will have a direct effect upon the library community. As recently as February 7, 1991, the Public Printer has testified before Congress of this intent.

## Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council is concerned about proposals that appear to raise the possibility of cost sharing for the dissemination of government information in electronic form. The Council believes that the basic principle of free access to government information should not be compromised, and that no charge should be levied for the information itself or to the end user.

The Council understands that there may be costs - such as telecommunications costs - associated with the distribution of electronic information that are a) highly variable, and b) not within the control of the government. The Council recommends that the Public Printer identify the means of disseminating such information to depository libraries at the lowest possible cost. The Council further recommends that the Public Printer investigate low-cost telecommunications and other strategies. The pilot projects now underway should yield valuable information about usage and actual costs.

The Council is troubled by proposed legislation that would permit "cost sharing" in the statute. Such proposals to date have been vague, undefined, and open-ended. As such, they threaten to compromise some of the basic principles of the Depository Program, as indicated above. The Council recommends that the Public Printer philosophically oppose such proposals.

*Response*

This recommendation will be addressed by the Office of General Counsel Opinion.

## Recommendation 11

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service prepare for Council's review minimum technical guidelines for depository libraries. These guidelines should include, but not be limited to, basic applied information technologies, such as:

1) workstation configurations including computer processing power, monitors with an adequate graphics capability, adequate mass storage, adequate random access memory (RAM), CD-ROM drives and printers;

2) appropriate software including database management systems, telecommunications and word processing which can accommodate ASCII;

3) telecommunications including modems and e-mail;

4) staff training to use the basic information technologies recommended and,

5) appropriate storage medium for the information products and equipment.

Once the final guidelines have been published in *Administrative Notes*, implementation of these guidelines should serve as goals for existing depositories and for all new depository libraries. These guidelines should be annually reviewed and revised to reflect

advances in information technologies.

Further, GPO should develop and maintain an agency and/or library contact list of resource personnel who can provide technical assistance and support for the application of information technologies.

**Rationale:** As more information is distributed to depository libraries in electronic formats, libraries should have the appropriate information technologies and expertise in their operation to access and utilize these formats on behalf of, and by, their constituents.

## *Response*

The Library Programs Service has developed proposed minimum technical guidelines for federal depository libraries. These guidelines were mailed to the Council members for their review during the second week of February.

## Recommendation 12

Uncertainty arose at the Fall 1990 Depository Library Council meeting concerning the question of whether costs that may be associated with receipt of electronic information, distributed through the Depository Library Program, may be passed on to library users. Although the Council believes this should not be done, Council requests the Public Printer to seek the advice of his legal Counsel on the dissemination of information in electronic form and its associated issues such as costs, and to provide copies of the resultant legal opinion to the Depository Library Council and have it printed in *Administrative Notes*.

## *Response*

This recommendation will be addressed by the Office of General Counsel Opinion.

ATTACHMENT A:
UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20410
MAR 04 1991

Mr. Robert W. Houk Public Printer
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 2040l

Dear Mr. Houk:

This is in response to your letter of January 24, 1991 regarding a recommendation from the Depository Library Council that this Agency comply with requirements to disseminate EPA publications through the Depository Library Network. As you note, we at EPA are fully committed to the citizen's right to full access to government information. We believe that an informed public is our strongest partner in protecting the environment. We recognize that our internal Agency mechanisms for assuring that EPA publications reach the Depository Library Network are not effective. I have had several conversations recently with Senator Ford and his staff about these and related printing issues. I believe he understands our strong commitment to improve EPA compliance with all printing regulations. In turn, we understand that it is in our interest for the public to have access to environmental information through the Depository Libraries. A task force, comprised primarily of printing, information management and procurement staff, has been charged with analyzing and improving the Agency's practices so the dissemination of these publications will occur in a proper manner.

The task force identified several sources of problems, and has initiated steps to correct them. For example, to improve EPA awareness of printing regulations, an Agency-wide memorandum on policy and procedures is in preparation. In addition,

the task force began contacting major field printing contacts to analyze their printing and distribution procedures. As a result of these dialogs, we expect major improvement in compliance with dissemination of EPA publications to the Depository Libraries. We have also identified questions about types of materials appropriate for the Depository Libraries and plan to meet with Federal Depository Library Program staff to assure that all appropriate EPA publications are processed as required. We are confident these steps will greatly improve access to EPA publications through the Depository Library Network.

Thank you for your concern and interest.

Sincerely,

Charles L. i zle Assistant Administrator

Dear Bob:

Thank you for conveying to me the Depository Library Council's continuing concerns about the Library's compliance with the provisions of Title 44, as expressed at its October 1990 meeting. As I indicated in my August 1990 letter responding to the same concern, the Library of Congress recognizes the great value of the Federal Depository Library Program and is committed to the free access to government information it represents. We have long been an active participant in the program and deposit a substantial number of publications every year. Those few that are not added are cooperative publications, exempt from the depository requirement under 44 *USC* 1903, or are published with gift and trust funds received through 2 *USC* 156-160.

As you know, msterials prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) for the use of the Congress are a special case. Materials prepared by the CRS may only be distributed outside the Congress under the limitations imposed by annual legislative branch appropriation language under the title, Congressional Research Services, Salaries and Expenses. I believe a more productive way to address this issue would be for someone on the Council to identify specific publications in question and to bring them to the attention of the Library's liaison to the Council, Ellen Hahn, prior to the Council meeting in April. She can then review the matter with appropriate colleagues within the Library and respond to the Council's concerns. We need to interrupt the cycle of generalized recommendations and responses in order to resolve this issue. Ms. Hahn can be reached at 202-707-5543, or, in writing, as Director for Public Service and Collection Management, Constituent Services, Library of Congress 20540.

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*

# 1991

# Comments to Robert W. Houk, U.S. Printer

## April 18, 1991 • Boston, MA

### Section I. Introduction

The Depository Library Council is confident that the Spring 1991 meeting marks the onset of a revitalization and enhancement of its advisory role to the Public Printer.

The Depository Library Council supports the Public Printer's plans to redirect the efforts of the Council to maximize its advisory capacity. Furthermore, Council looks forward to improved communication among GPO, library organizations, and government information providers and users.

To achieve this objective, the Council strongly urges that the annual Depository Library Conference not be restricted to the Washington, D.C. area. The current meeting structure provides an opportunity for the depository community as a whole to convene for discussion of matters of common concern. One way in which Council meetings have provided an opportunity for wider input has been through location of its meetings in different places throughout the country. Council is concerned that if all the meetings are in the Washington, D.C. area, the opportunity for wider many to participate will be lost. Accordingly, Council believes that the annual Depository Library Council should be held in other parts of the country at least every other year.

Additionally, Council will assist in the development of appropriate mechanisms to ensure communications between the depository library community and the Public Printer.

We welcome this opportunity to be more involved in the development of the policy decision-making process as it relates to the dissemination of, and access to, federal government information.

### Section II. DLC Role and Responsibilities

A. In accepting the new directions set forth by the Public Printer, Council believes that addressing policy issues which reflect the diversity of the users of the Federal Depository Library Program is its major challenge.

To this end, Council's role should be:

1. to assist the Public Printer in defining and focusing on policy issues faced by the Depository Library Program;

2. to critique policy options as they are developed, and,

3. to review and evaluate implementation of those options.

B. In addition, Council recognizes its responsibility to consult with the depository library community and the Government Printing Office to address operational concerns and problems.

C. The Depository Library Council also recognizes its role in assisting GPO in setting the agendas for future Annual Depository Library Conferences and Advisory Council meetings.

D. These and other tasks will be accomplished with the assistance of Council Coordinating Committees such as:

1) Policy

2) Operations

3) Program.

E. To foster communications among the GPO, Depository Library Council and the depository library community, Council suggests the formation of a new Administrative Notes column for the Operations Committee.

## Section III. Issues for Continuing Consultation between the Public Printer and the Depository Library Council

The following are policy issues critical to the depository library community. These are offered as potential agenda items for future Council meetings.

1) The strategic plan for the Government Printing Office.

2) Legislative proposals for the modernization of the Government Printing Office.

3) Online information for the Depository Program and attendant policy issues, including but not limited to, databases to be directly available from GPO, agency databases available via a GPO gateway, and cost sharing.

4) Relationship of GPO and depository libraries to the National Research and Education Network (NREN).

5) Fugitive information, including "no cost to the government" contracts that result in publications not distributed to depository libraries.

6) Restrictions on the use of government information, including licensing, user fees, and other restrictions.

7) Formats in which Federal government information is distributed through the Depository Library Program.

8) Restructuring of the Depository Program.

9) Preservation issues -- e.g. retention of masters for CD's and microforms.

10) Programs for public awareness of the Depository Library Program (marketing).

*Originally input at Oklahoma State University*

# Depository Library Council Discussion Papers

## Fall 1991 • Washington, DC

### Discussion Paper 1a
Submitted by Janet Fisher

### *Question*

Are there some specific documents or databases that can be identified as the first or highest priority for electronic dissemination? If so, what are they and what criteria can be used to identify such materials?

### *Summary*

Depository librarians want maximum access to government information. The Government Printing Office (GPO) can improve access by offering government publications in as many formats as possible, so librarians can choose the most appropriate for their collection. Librarians also urge GPO to provide better documentation for material offered in digital format.

Title 44 (44 USC 1901 et seq.) directs the Government Printing Office to make federal publications available to the public-- without mention of format. GPO distributes depository publications on paper, microfiche, and, lately, has sent some out on compact disk.

GPO sends copies of all depository materials to the 52 regional depositories. In some instances, regional depositories receive the same publication in two media: e.g., paper and microfiche. Selective depository libraries can choose which categories of publications they want to receive and also which format, of those offered, they will receive. For certain of these categories, GPO also allows them to choose the media.

Librarians and their patrons find the material received through the depository program to be a valuable source of information. They are anxious to have access to all the government information possible, and work with whatever media carries it, within the limitations of their resources.

However, depository libraries have a wide range in the support available to them for working with different media. If an item is available in only one format, and the library hasn't the equipment to use that format, they will likely forego selecting that item and deprive their patrons of that information. Depositories hope for maximum choice in formats, so they can offer patrons the largest possible selection of material.

Technology at this time offers two main media for electronically distributing government information: CD-ROM disks and online services. Depository librarians suggest online services be used to distribute time sensitive information that needs to be distributed quickly, such as news releases, regulations, and legislative updates, and information that is frequently changed. CD-ROM would be more appropriate for cumulative publications, such as indexes/abstracts, statistical cumulations, and monographs.

GPO should carefully consider the permanency of any media it uses, especially if it distributes a work on only one media. Literature suggests CD's have shelf-life of anywhere from three to fifty years.

Depository librarians are also concerned about user support for material received in digital form. GPO should have on hand a support staff of several people, able to instruct depository librarians or staff in choices of public domain software to access the programs at a basic level, and provide additional guidance with computer sources in general terms (it is unnecessary to know every piece of software). It was suggested to me that the depositories would be willing to consider having a computer

technician as part of their staff (at least part-time) if they would be able to link up with GPO at that same level.

Printed documentation should also be made available for every electronic source. If that documentation is on the source, e.g. on the CD, that is acceptable. If instruction and methods for accessing the product's content are not available at the time of distribution, then the product should be considered incomplete and not be distributed. I was alerted to the situation that documentation for some of the software installed on distributed CD's is not the same as the separate documentation sold through another federal publications distributor, the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

Electronic products should also be as complete as their counterparts in paper and microfiche. The software distributed with the disk should also provide access to all data on the disk. If these situations do not exist, then depository libraries should be made aware of this information through a timely current awareness tool or some type of notice to librarians.

Librarians were anxious to have a voice in issues dealing with format. With the non-standard production of software to access the CD's, libraries are confronting the need for technical assistance and additional staff time to learn to get into each program and perform tasks in it. Time, money, and staff size limit libraries' choices in the selection of electronic products more than it limits selection of paper or microfiche. A manual or documentation package that is readable and easily understood would be an asset. The agencies would need to take notice of this situation and correct it.

Eight years ago, Superintendent of Documents Directive 13 (SOD-13) was written to provide guidelines for the microfiching of paper documents. Documents with 14 pages or less and those documents of a statistical nature that had tables and numbers throughout were considered unsuitable for putting on microfiche. Although SOD-13 stands as an example of criteria to follow in the choice of format, it is in need of revision and is not strictly adhered to. Since this directive needs to be updated, it could also address electronic media or serve as a model for another directive or guideline for divining the suitable format in which to distribute information.

It is not reasonable to come up with a list of suitable publications for electronic dissemination, although several issues stood out in consideration. Of course, librarians would like to be able to make their own choices from a menu of formats. Barring that situation, they would be amenable to having guidelines for those decisions be standardized and firmly adhered to.

## Discussion Paper 1b
Submitted by Gary Cornwell

### *Question*

Are there different criteria for material already in the FDLP in paper and microfiche than for information not available through the FDLP? If so, what are they?

This question has been interpreted in a number of different ways by those offering comments. However, based on GPO's introductory statement requesting Council's assistance in identifying and prioritizing electronic products and services for dissemination to depository libraries, perhaps the question should be rephrased to read: Do different criteria exist for including electronic products and services in the FDLP when the information has already been distributed to depository libraries in traditional formats? If so, what are they?

The answer to this question is a resounding no! The Depository Library Council is already on record as seeing no equivalency between the paper/microfiche version of a title and the electronic version.(1) Consequently, the basic premise on which the question is based is erroneous. Since the two are not equivalent, there would be no case where the electronic information was already in the FDLP in either paper or microfiche. Therefore, it is the opinion of Council, that GPO should follow the same criteria for including this material in the FDLP as they would for any other government publication.

It is clearly evident, even in instances where the print and electronic versions of a title contain the same information, that the applicability of the data is radically different. For example, there is little difference in the information content of the *County and City Data Book* in either paper or CD-ROM format. However, data from the CD-ROM can be downloaded and manipulated in a variety of ways in which the paper format cannot. Further, a limitless number of customized subsets and reports can be generated utilizing the CD-ROM version whereas the user is limited to the published format of the paper version.

Other CD-ROMs produced by the Census Bureau, such as *County Business Patterns*, contain a wealth of information that is simply not included in the print versions of the title. With even larger data sets, such as the 1990 decennial census, no attempt whatsoever will be made to distribute all the information in print format. The vast majority of this material will only be distributed in machine readable format.

It should be noted at this juncture that the print sources which have traditionally appeared represent a valuable subset of information and data that is extremely pertinent and useful to the user community. In this instance, the traditional print sources represent an irreplaceable adjunct to the electronic sources of information. Other white papers will discuss in more detail the importance of keeping traditional formats in the FDLP. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that many libraries within the FDLP are not in position to access electronic products and consequently are dependent upon the print sources. Additionally, much of the graphic information contained in traditional formats is not replicated in the electronic versions.

If criteria exist which are to be considered for including government publications into the Federal Depository Library Program, those criteria are clearly articulated in Title 44 *USC*. Unfortunately, even with traditional formats, the GPO has a less than satisfactory track record for obtaining copies of documents for distribution to depository libraries. The problem with fugitive documents is both long-standing and well-publicized. It will not be discussed here except to note that no solutions to the problem appear to be forthcoming. Indeed, the extent and likely continuation of the problem is typified by the fact that two private vendors (CIS and Readex) have both developed proposals for publishing and marketing collections of fugitive government publications. GPO's recently released "Guidelines for the Provision of Government Publications for Depository Library Distribution" have done little to correct or alleviate the problems associated with fugitive documents. Consequently, based on GPO's problems with delivering paper copies of documents into the program, it seems redundant to consider limiting criteria that would restrict the distribution of government information produced in non-traditional formats.

The real issue here is rather than devising criteria and methods for restricting the flow of government information to depository libraries, the GPO should be redoubling their efforts to preserve and expand the system to include all government publications regardless of format. At a time when the rest of the federal bureaucracy is rapidly advancing into the 21st century, GPO appears to be slow and overly cautious in responding to the challenges of new technology. GPO's reluctance to enlist and utilize electronic sources such as the Internet (which would offer key staff the opportunity to, at the very minimum, monitor developments in the field of government documents) is puzzling and frustrating to the depository community. An Internet connection would allow federal agencies, such as the Department of State, the capability to disseminate their online services free to depository libraries-- thus reducing the reliance on private vendors. This type of thoughtful cost savings would be greatly appreciated by those libraries on the Internet system; and those libraries not on Internet could still receive the information as they do now. Such a bold move may even help non-Internet librarians to convince their administrations to gain access to the service.

It is interesting to note the latest issue of *Administrative Notes* reported that information gleaned from the Census Test Disk II pilot project was still under analysis. Obviously, any data gathered from that project has been superseded by developments in the past two years. Specifically, depository libraries' capabilities to incorporate electronic information has increased by an untold magnitude; the Census Bureau has refined and enhanced their CD-ROM products; and the GPO has successfully distributed many other CD-ROM products produced by a variety of governmental agencies to depository libraries. The time is certainly at hand to move beyond the analysis of antiquated data and begin mainstreaming electronic products and services

into the depository library program.

Recent developments have made it increasingly clear that government agencies will continue to produce both print and electronic products, as well as add enhancements to them when necessary. Proposals such as NREN, GPO WINDO, and the revision of A-130 are all designed to incorporate the dissemination of federal information in electronic format. Additionally, private vendors, such as Hilton United Corporation, have developed proposals for the low cost dissemination of all digitally produced government information. The irony of the situation is that GPO is already mandated by law to distribute the information to depository libraries via the FDLP. If the GPO were fulfilling its mission, would there be a need for GPO WINDO or similar legislation that might be proposed?

Clearly, six of the ten questions posed for discussion at this meeting deal with restricting libraries' access to government information and none deal with alternatives or strategies for an increased role by the GPO in information gathering and distribution. While offering the potential to significantly enhance the FDLP, proposals such as GPO WINDO have a number of caveats associated with them. Indeed, virtually all these proposals are dependent upon some sort of restructuring of the depository library system. It would seem that the entire information industry would be better served by discussion of issues designed to enhance the flow of government information rather than restrict it. For example, McClure, Hernon and others have laid the groundwork for the discussion of the restructuring of the depository library system.(2) NREN or GPO WINDO could certainly serve as the impetus for a national conference consisting of JCP, GPO, federal publishers, and recognized leaders in the field of libraries and government documents to develop strategies for realigning the system with the current needs of both the information producing agencies and the information seeking public.

The amount of legislation proposed during the past few years is a clear indication that Congress and federal agencies are ready for bold new approaches to dissemination of government information. GPO is poised by both historical precedent and by law to assume a leadership role in these endeavors. However, the time for quick, positive action is now. Perhaps the next Council meeting should be devoted to developing strategies designed to enhance the program. One suggestion would be to have an expert on the Internet write a white paper describing the various options and costs for providing GPO access to the service. As many of these experts reside in the Washington area, they could be brought in to take part in the discussion at little or no cost.

The increasing fear among depository librarians is that if the GPO continues the trend of restricting public access to government information, as is suggested by the nature of many of the questions posed to Council, agencies will continue to bypass the GPO for dissemination of their products and services. The ultimate by-product of that action will most assuredly be the demise of the FDLP and the GPO itself.

> (1) Recommendation 6, Fall 1990 Depository Library Council Meeting. The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service continue to offer print/microfiche publications for selection when corresponding electronic products or services become available.
>
> Rationale: Council understands the equivalency/duplication between paper and microfiche. However,it does not accept a similar equivalency/ duplication between those formats and electronic formats.
>
> 2) For a representative sample of discussion dealing with the restructuring of the DPL, see: Hernon, Peter and McClure, Charles, *Public Access to Government Information: Issues, Trends, and Strategies*, 2nd edition, Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1988, pp 365-390.

**Discussion Paper 1c**
Submitted by Sioux Plummer

## *Question*

Since staff and monetary resources for the FDLP are limited, what criteria can Council recommend to assist GPO to prioritize its efforts to identify and obtain electronic information products and services for dissemination to the depository libraries? Some specific issues include:

(a) Are there different criteria for electronic information that can be physically disseminated (on diskette, CD-ROM, etc.) than for information that can be downloaded by the depository libraries from a bulletin board or access through online interactive information services? If so, what are they? Should any format have a higher priority than the others? Why or why not?

Discussion: The discussion herein does not necessarily represent my own viewpoints, but those of many. Some statements are deliberately for the sake of more discussion.

There seems to be general consensus among depository librarians, and those depository library patrons familiar with electronic information whom I interviewed, on this subject. Also, question 1(c) begs other questions.

Perhaps the above question should be turned around to ask: What types of information are best disseminated in which formats? Then the question of priority is whether information that will be disseminated in one kind of format should be budgeted for and financed before another kind of information. There are certainly differences in formats that can be attached to different kinds of information, so another question is how to establish priorities based on formats.

Types of information in the following format categories include:

> a) On-line Services (Electronic Bulletin Boards, Electronic Conferences, Electronic Mail)

> Time-sensitive, fast-breaking news and notices; items that are short in length and change frequently; e.g. news releases, GPO administrative news, Consumer Price Index, legislative status, etc.

> b) Electronically stored (CD-ROM)

> Items that are not updated frequently, have large databases, and/or have archival or long-term value, such as historical statistics and references, monographs, and less-used titles. Examples are the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), a year's worth of the Congressional Record, and Supreme Court decisions. It was suggested that a good combination of both CD-ROM technology and on-line telecommunications was to make available to depository libraries a dial-up index that lists information stored on CD-ROM.

> c)Hard Copy & (Paper, Microfiche, Floppy Disk)

> After discussing this with others, I found Steve Hayes' description of this category typical of most other's point of view. There still appears to be the need for the printed page for the following: frequently consulted information, information requiring long periods of reading a great deal of material, information requiring simultaneous consultation of other resource materials such as maps and tables, and information that has illustrations, graphics and/or pictures where color enhances the reader's understanding or enjoyment of the data.

In addition, I was advised of the value of having such information on floppy disk in order for it to be printed by the reader, but the printed product must have correct page breaks, etc. to make it readable and useful. Examples given were GPO's Administrative Notes Table of Contents and manuals such as ACIR (Advisory Committee on Inter-Governmental Relations). I

would be interested to hear more discussion on this point.

Finally, some questions for further discussion that were posed to me under this category

- Are people REALLY still using paper and, if so, how much?

- In some cases, is eliminating more paper and establishing more CD-ROM work stations in libraries significantly cheaper?

- Is there enough data to give qualified answers to these questions?

Alaskan librarians recognize that our state has been on the cutting edge of technology for some time, due to our great dependence on satellites for long distance telecommunications, whether it be for voice or data transmission. However, even though satellite communication is not distance sensitive (remember, the earth is round), there are not yet uniform or unified telecommunications tariffs (telephone rates). As a result, Alaska librarians have perhaps a greater interest in the physical dissemination of information products rather than on-line services due to the high cost of transmission, in spite of their desire to participate more in electronic bulletin boards and other such forums.

Alaska is certainly not alone with this problem, therefore perhaps there should be greater emphasis by GPO, Council, Congress, FCC and others toward solving the cost inequity problems before putting a great deal of time and effort into establishing criteria and priorities which would make certain information and formats more available and accessible than others. If telecommunications costs were more affordable for both GPO and depository libraries, then information seekers could set their own criteria and priorities as to the format in which they receive information.

## Discussion Paper 1d
Submitted by Robert L Oakley

### *Question*

Under what circumstances should the availability of Government information from other sources be a factor in setting GPO's priorities for making additional dissemination through the FDLP? Does it make a difference if the other source is free or at low cost? Does it make a difference if the other source is the Federal government or not?

This question carries with it several assumptions that are at the least troubling, and probably wrong. On first reading, it appears to be an invitation to continue the discussion engendered by the Paperwork Reduction Act, to wit: to what extent should the availability of government information from other private or public sources affect the dissemination of that information by an agency? However, a more careful reading reveals that it is narrower and more focused than the Paperwork Reduction Act discussion since it focuses solely on GPO's role to disseminate information to Depository Libraries.

In asking about GPO's priorities for making additional dissemination, the pertinence of the question is difficult to ascertain. It is not up to the Government Printing Office to set priorities among publications issued by agencies and decide that some are disseminated while others are not. Under Title 44 of the *U.S. Code*, agencies are required to submit all publications(l) to the Government Printing Office for dissemination through the Federal Depository Library Program.(2) The decision about which publications are to be issued rests with the issuing agencies, not with the Government Printing office, and all such publications are mandated to be part of the program. Further, there is no exception in the statute for electronic publication. The concept of electronic publication is now well established, and material published in that form should be fully a part of the Depository program.

Moreover, the use of the term additional dissemination in the question suggests that the initial dissemination has been made and that distribution through the Depository Program is merely supplemental. This is the wrong approach to public dissemination of government documents. The initial dissemination of a document is through the issuing agency and through

the Federal Depository Library Program to those libraries that have selected the document in question. Depository distribution can in no way be seen or be implied to be supplemental. Other dissemination - from public and private sources - may provide additional access, better software, or other value-added enhancements. But depository distribution is a primary means of disseminating information to the public.

For the foregoing reasons, the question under discussion is troublesome. The assumptions behind the question are a distraction from the real issues. The writer does not wish to beg the question, but he felt constrained to point out the difficulty.

Since the decision to issue a publication is an individual agency decision, how should an agency approach the questions posed in Question ld? Ab initio, the availability of government information from other sources should not be a factor. Government agencies must make the determination about their information dissemination program according to their own mission, goals, and the needs of their users.

Some agencies have, however, in fact, looked at the market place as a factor when making such decisions under the now discredited Circular A-130 from the Office of Management and Budget. OMB is currently redrafting that circular in response to widespread criticism. If an agency were to be influenced by another product, it would have to look beyond the mere availability of that product to ask other, sometimes difficult, questions. For example, it would have to inquire about the financial stability of the company putting out the product and whether or not it is likely to be able to continue to do so. Second, it would have to look closely at the cost of the product, both to libraries and to end users. Part of the mission of the agency is likely to be to make the information available directly to the public free or at a reasonable price. Reliance on an expensive commercial service cannot fulfill that objective. Third, a related consideration is whether the company could or would meet the obligation of Title 44 to make the information available free to depository libraries. Fourth, in some cases, the agency may have to inquire about the ownership of the company making the information available. Without impugning any current information vendor, as a policy matter it does not seem appropriate for government agencies or citizens of the United States to rely on foreign-owned companies for basic information about the laws of their country. No doubt, an agency would consider many other factors as well. The availability of information from other sources may be a consideration, but only a secondary one, and one that must be tempered by examination of a number of related issues.

Despite the cautions noted at the outset of this discussion, there may be two instances when the Government Printing Office may be called upon to establish priorities for the dissemination of information. The first is for those products and services for which GPO is the issuing agency. In those cases, the discussion in the foregoing paragraph applies fully to the Government Printing Office itself. Its mission is to disseminate information to the public. One mechanism by which that is done is to disseminate information through the Depository Program at no cost to the library or its users. In some cases, the dissemination can and should be by paper or microform. In some cases, electronic publication may be more effective or more efficient. In the case of those publications - such as the *Monthly Catalog* - which GPO produces itself, GPO has a responsibility to produce the best information product it can to fulfill its mission to the public.

It should not shy away from producing a good product simply because another product exists in the market.(3) The second area in which the Government Printing Office might set priorities is in the transition to making available electronic products and services created by other agencies. These new information products have been developing rapidly and GPO distribution to depositories has not kept pace. As discussed previously, the existence of those products from the agency alone does not exempt the agency from its obligations under Title 44 of the *U.S. Code*. Under that section, all government publications are to be made available through the Federal Depository Library Program. There is no exception for electronic publications. As a result, it is incumbent upon the Government Printing office to determine the best, and most cost effective way to deliver that information to the public through the Federal Depository Library Program.

The GPO Windo Bill, introduced by Representative Rose this past spring, offers one mechanism by which the information could be made available. Under this proposal, the Government Printing Office would maintain some datafiles itself. However,

it would also house a file server that would act as a switching device - a gateway - to direct depository library users through the computer at the Government Printing Office to a database maintained in a Federal agency. The technology to accomplish this goal is already easily available. The problems that may occur will arise because of scale. With 1,400 depository libraries, it is not known how many simultaneous users there would be of the system. Nonetheless, GPO should begin immediately to experiment with making electronic data available in this way.

A second means by which electronic information could be made available even more effectively is through an Internet connection to the Government Printing Office. Unlike a dial-up connection, an Internet connection would be free to users throughout the country. Although not all depository libraries have access to the Internet, for those who do the information can be made available much more effectively and much less expensively in this way.

The question remains as to which datafiles should be made available electronically first. How should the Government Printing Office begin to set priorities in this area? The writer suggests that many, but not all, of the core documents required to be distributed to every depository library might offer a starting place.(4) The Government Printing Office might move quickly to make available online such documents as the *Congressional Record* and the *Federal Register*. Beyond those core documents required under the depository program, it would be appropriate to begin to move in the area based on the availability of information in electronic form together with real or anticipated usage of such data. For example, the *Toxic Release Inventory* of the Environmental Protection Agency has been widely publicized as an electronic file highly useful to local communities. It is both available electronically and likely to be widely used by local governments, environmental interest groups, and interested citizens. No doubt, there are many other datafiles maintained by government agencies which would also generate substantial interest on the part of potential users.

The Government Printing Office should consider reviewing the published list of available datafiles in consultation with the Depository Library Council for real or anticipated use by the public. It could then begin to make those files available in the most appropriate format. In some cases, where the database is not too large and does not change a great deal, CD-ROM might be the appropriate format. In other cases, where the data changes daily, online availability might be more appropriate.

(1) 44 U.S.C. 1901 reads as follows: Government publication as used in this chapter, means informational matter which is published as an individual document at Government expense, or as required by law.

(2) See 44 U.S.C. 1902: Government publications, except those determined by their issuing components to be required for official use only or for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value and publications classified for reasons of national security, shall be made available to depository libraries through the facilities of the Superintendent of Documents for public information.

(3) Defining the dissemination objectives for an information product or service will vary. Relevant factors may include the need for an official government information product, the needs of depository library users, the cost and availability of competing products, and the level of service available elsewhere ... The mere existence of an equivalent product or service would not preclude an agency from offering a product or service. Even if an equivalent product or service fully met the dissemination objectives of the agency, the agency could still determine that its own dissemination program should continue. (Emphasis added.) House Report 101-927, Report to Accompany H.R. 3695, at 56 (1990).

(4) See Appendix A, "Guidelines for the Depository Library System" (1988). Items which might be considered first include: *Code of Federal Regulations, Congressional Record, Federal Register, Monthly Catalog, Publications Reference File, Slip Laws. Statutes at Large, U.S. Code, U.S. Reports, Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents.*

## Discussion 1e
Submitted by Chris Kitchens

### *Question*

If GPO is to increase the amount of electronic information in the FDLP and remain within its current resources, it will have to reduce resources in other areas. One possible area of savings is to eliminate paper or microfiche distribution of data that is distributed electronically; another is to convert additional material from paper to microfiche. Are there criteria for implementation of these options that will minimize the impact caused by such actions? Are there other alternatives for resource reallocations that should be considered?

The explosion of new information formats is creating a funding problem for GPO. Without additional monies, the agency is faced with the necessity of providing depository libraries access to increasing amounts of electronic formats. A priori, this obligation calls for resource reallocation. However, underlying any decision there must be a clear understanding of the costs involved in distributing both old and new formats: set up costs, one time vs. ongoing costs, life cycle costs. These factors should be closely studied to determine, if in fact, electronic information necessitates funding reallocation.

At this time there is a lack of published studies addressing these issues. The Electronic Pilot Projects are either still ongoing or the results are being compiled. The Library Programs Service is just completing a feasibility study and cost benefit analysis of the product line of the *Monthly Catalog* - paper, microfiche, machine readable tapes, CD-ROM and online service. A close analysis of all these projects is called for before any far reaching measures are implemented which will affect one of the major nationwide distribution networks of government information. Project findings may indicate that increasing information in electronic formats will in itself be a savings. Going online or using CD-ROM products may not necessarily be as cost prohibitive as speculated.

While these results are under study, two measures have been proposed to offset the cost of electronic products: (l) conversion of additional material from paper to microfiche, (2) elimination of paper or microfiche distribution of data that is available electronically.

In the first scenario, the Depository Library community is concerned with the already existing glut of microfiche. Additional conversion is seen as compounding the problem. But if GPO chooses to proceed in this direction, the criteria established in SOD-13 could still be used to minimize the impact of more conversion. However, it is necessary to point out that SOD-13 is outdated and sorely in need of revision.

In the second scenario, criteria have not yet been established to determine which paper/microfiche publications should be eliminated when the data is also distributed electronically. At the Spring '91 DLC meeting, Council recommended to the Public Printer that, at this time, the Library Programs Service continue to offer print/microfiche publications for selection when corresponding electronic products or services become available. In general the library community accepts the equivalency/duplication between paper and microfiche. But, in the case of electronic products, the issue is not seen as the substitution of one format for another. Instead, it is the sacrifice of one type of information for another.

Usage of electronic products is hindered by some of the following problems: incomplete text files, inadequate or incomplete indexing methods, software providing only partial access to the database or disk, and documentation not available at the time the product is ready. These and other problems necessitate that the depository librarians not only be computer knowledgeable but software and hardware "gurus" -- a major difference between using electronic products or microfiche. In this light, before criteria for elimination of dual formats are established, the impact of such action needs to be determined. Other factors to consider are: lost access, restricted access, staffing, type of user. It is important to keep in mind that technologies generally overlay rather than eliminate each other. Daniel Boorstin has commented that people expected print to displace the use of memory, the telephone to displace the postal system, the automobile to displace the bicycle and television to displace radio,

movies and books. But that's not what happens. New technologies transform the use of old ones. They don't replace them.(1)

Total elimination of one form of information for another is not the only viable solution to cut dissemination costs. There is a need to explore various new combinations and methods of information delivery.

In all consideration and discussions current legislation such as NREN and WINDO must be taken into account. Both pieces of legislation will have a major impact on depository libraries' access to electronic information. The following suggestions are a few other possibilities which could also be considered as cost saving measures for resource reallocations:

Restructuring of the publication selection process can accomplish elimination of unwanted, trivial or nonsubstantive items, thus cutting production and distribution costs. Refining could be done by adding more item numbers for individual titles. A total restructuring would necessitate exploring alternatives to item numbers.

Re-examination by GPO of its internal information dissemination channels could lead to possible reallocation of funding from cost savings realized in other areas.

Restructuring of the Depository Libraries is a natural outgrowth of resource reallocation. This restructuring could take the form of a tiered system as discussed in OTA *Informing the Nation*(2) and ARL *Technology and US Government Information Policies*(3). In addition, restructuring could also consider supra regionals, a more structured depository network or a smaller program with fewer but more efficient depositories.

Regardless of cost savings, the changes being brought about by electronic formats will inevitably result in some form of restructuring. Change is often a painful process and contrary to human nature. During this time it is important that we keep before us our common goal of providing equitable, no fee access to government information for all citizens.

> (1) Peter Briscol, "Ashurbanipal's Enduring Archetype: Thoughts on the Library's Role in the Future", *College & Research Libraries* 47:2 (March 1986) 121-26.

> (2) U.S. Congress, OTA, *Informing the Nation: Federal Information Dissemination in an Electronic Age*. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Congress, OTA, 1988).

> (3) Association of Research Libraries, Task Force on Government Information in Electronic Format, Report No. 3. (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1987).

## Discussion Paper 2(a)
Submitted by Mark Vonderhaar

### *The Question and its Context*

From the letter of Public Printer Robert W. Houk to the Depository Library Council, June 25, 1991:

> 2. If an online service or bulletin board is made available for a limited amount of free use by depository libraries, how should that use be allocated? Currently all material distributed through the FDLP, except the paper edition of the bound Congressional Record, is equally available to regional and selecting libraries, and each library receives a single copy. The analogous dissemination criterion for online information would be dividing the available use into equal parts, so that the regional libraries and each selecting library received the same amount of time online. While this appears to be the easiest dissemination criterion to implement and the most fair, it may not optimize public access to information in an online environment that requires a time-based allocation, rather than physical distribution. What alternative criteria exist and what are the benefits and problems associated with those alternatives? Some alternatives

that could be addressed include:

(a) Should GPO offer online access only, or in higher volume, to regional libraries? If so, what additional obligations should the regional libraries assume?

(b) Should GPO offer a higher volume of online access to libraries with programs for broad public access? If so, what criteria should be used to evaluate public access?

(c) Should GPO avoid duplicative dissemination to those depository libraries who already have online access through another source in order to make more time available to libraries that do not have an alternative? If so, how should this be accomplished? If not, why not?

## *Question*

Let us explicitly assume for the sake of discussion a condition that the question seems to presuppose, namely, that the demand for online usage in at least some depository libraries will be greater than the amount of fully subsidized usage that GPO can afford to supply, at least if the subsidized usage were to be allocated equally.

Title 44 of the *U.S. Code* outlines the special duties of regional libraries. Section 1912 mandates that, in addition to fulfilling the regular requirements for depositories, regionals will: ... retain at least one copy of all Government publications either in printed or microfacsimile form (except those authorized to be discarded by the Superintendent of Documents); and within the region served will provide interlibrary loan, reference service, and assistance for depository libraries in the disposal of unwanted Government publications.

More specific direction as to the responsibilities of regionals is provided in "Instructions to Depository Libraries":

The principal responsibility of a Regional Federal Depository Library is to ensure the comprehensiveness and integrity of the State's or region's depository resources. This is accomplished in two ways: first, purposeful collection development on the part of the Regional aimed at developing a comprehensive Government documents collection under the control of the Regional library; second, supervising the discard process in the State or relevant region to ensure that documents are retained or offered to other selectives. Within the region they serve, designated Regional depositories must provide interlibrary loan and reference service to both depository and nondepository libraries. (Edition of 4-88, chapter 2, p. 1)

From these excerpts it is clear that a regional library is required to take an active role in shaping an overall strategy for access to government documents within its region. As the text of the statute and rules establishes, this is mainly accomplished in two ways: (1) by guaranteeing the availability of every item disseminated by GPO through comprehensive receipt and permanent retention, except as regional discards might be authorized by the Superintendent of Documents; and (2) by supervising the disposition of items discarded by selective depositories within the region. These traditional techniques for ensuring the comprehensiveness and integrity of the State's or region's depository resources reflect the imperative of maintaining locally a copy of each document if access is not to be lost altogether.

For all but a few of the many thousands of titles that GPO's Library Programs Service (LPS) distributes each year, GPO serves merely as a printing services contractor and as a disseminator. The issuing agency is the publisher -- a role that comprises creation of the document, control over its release, and usually its primary dissemination as well.

Even if a publication is one of the select number that are maintained in inventory for the GPO sales program, dissemination through LPS remains a one-time event. While LPS temporarily retains a small number of copies of most documents to fill claims, it does not retain a library of the documents cataloged and distributed. (LPS does maintain a shelflist, but the cataloged documents themselves are transferred to the National Archives. There the documents are stored, but they are not readily accessible.)

Since it has no library, LPS is unable to either make loans of documents or to handle reference questions. Thus, continuing public access to paper and fiche documents distributed through the depository system depends entirely upon retention of the documents by regionals. LPS in fact often relies upon a regional depository library in the Washington, D.C. area to meet its own reference needs. For all intents and purposes, regionals are the libraries of last resort in the depository system.

In the origination and distribution of online information to depositories, the distinction between a federal agency as publisher and GPO as a service contractor/disseminator would still usually obtain. In a manner analogous to the creation of a printed document, a federal agency would decide whether a particular online database is to be produced, and if so, what its contents are to be. The agency also would be responsible for the design of the database, just as it would structure the contents of a print publication. Moreover, the agency would determine the release schedule and updating cycle for the database.

GPO's role with respect to online access might be to provide depository libraries with an essentially transparent gateway to an agency computer system which serves as a host for the database. Or, the GPO gateway might include software that performs mediation functions, thereby offering a more consistent interface to a variety of agency databases. Alternatively, GPO might negotiate inter-agency agreements to give libraries direct access to agency-maintained online systems for a measured amount of time, as explored in the DOE pilot project. Another possibility would be for GPO to operate its own online system, as it now does on a small scale for Supreme Court decisions furnished through the Court's experimental Project Hermes.

Although the distinction between the agency as publisher and GPO as the processor and secondary distributor is just as clear for online services as it is for printed documents, there are differences occasioned by the nature of electronic distribution that require a fresh interpretation of the traditional role of the regional as the custodian of at least one copy of every depository publication. One difference is that neither the regional nor any other depository would receive from GPO anything that could be likened to a complete copy of an online database. Since as a rule it would be unrealistic and counterproductive to download a whole database, the online information actually retrieved would be incomplete by design. Comprehensiveness inheres in the potential for retrieval, rather than in what is actually retrieved. Only the information desired by a patron at a given moment is delivered, so that less becomes more. A case could therefore be made that the comprehensiveness of the regional library with respect to online services is determined by the adequacy of the allocated usage for meeting reference needs.

Another difference presented by electronic distribution is that information received online would be impermanent, in two senses. First, the information retrieved in each search generally would not be in a form that would readily lend itself to retention by the library and integration with its permanent collection. And second, the source database might be altered without notice, so that the retrieved information would neither represent a true copy of any part of the source database, nor would it indicate the currently obtainable results of the retrieval technique employed.

The key to permanent access to online information in the regional context is not physical custody, but rather the continuing availability of the online publication from the source agency. (Obviously, there are related questions about the archiving of databases by federal agencies, but these are beyond the scope of the present discussion.)

Publication by the agency becomes a continuing act, and the assurance of permanence, from the point of view of the depository and the patron, is identical to the assurance of comprehensiveness: the adequacy of allocated usage for the satisfaction of reference requirements.

Although online dissemination relieves a regional of its erstwhile obligation to maintain a copy of all information received, it does not necessarily follow that the regional is exempt from any obligation to provide online-related reference services within its region that are analogous to the interlibrary loan and reference service that it must provide with respect to its print and microform holdings. Moreover, even though the regional's authority to grant permission for the discarding of publications received by selective depositories cannot be exercised in the same way for online services, it still makes sense in the context of online services to posit some responsibility on the part of the regional to promote the efficient use of government information resources for the benefit of all depository library patrons within the region.

An important question is whether a regional would have authority to coordinate adjustments in the allocation of online access time. If so, would such adjustments be entirely voluntary on the part of selective depositories, or might the interests of the region as a whole entail compulsory curtailments as to the choice and amount of online service that a selective depository could receive? One potential solution might be the elaboration of a "state plan" concept to address in detail the allocation of online usage in a way that would receive the broad endorsement of the depositories in the region.

An outline of topics for systematic discussion of this question follows. Comments received from the depository library community are summarized in Appendix A.

Topics for Discussion in the Consideration of Question 2(a)

1. (a) Does the current distribution of authority and responsibilities between regional and selective depository libraries for selection, retention, and disposition of depository publications, and for provision of support services, work well with respect to print and microfiche documents?

(b) Do these current arrangements strike a balance that is worthy of preservation in any policies developed for the selection, re-allocation, and use of online services?

2. (a) Could the potential for better service to depository library patrons through access to federal online databases be realized most economically through allocation of online usage to regional libraries only?

(b) To consider another possibility, should the allocation of online usage favor heavily used but highly selective depositories, on the theory that they have fewer resources in print and microform that might be able to wholly or partially meet patrons' needs?

(c) Would strict equality in online services allocation to all selecting depositories be the most satisfactory overall approach from the point of view of the patron?

3. Assuming that some online usage is to be made available by LPS to both regional and selective depositories:

(a) Does a regional depository have any obligation to use its allocation of online time to provide reference service for other libraries within its region?

(b) If so, does the regional's obligation extend only to selective depositories, or does it also extend to nondepository libraries, in keeping with Chapter 2, Section B of "Instructions to Depository Libraries"?

(c) If there is an obligation for a regional to use online time in support of reference services for selective depositories, then:

When a selective depository requests services involving online searching from its regional, should it matter whether the selective currently receives an allocation of online time directly from LPS for the database in question?

(d) If a regional is obligated to use its allocation of online time to support reference service to other libraries, must such reference service be offered on the same basis as it is made available to the regional's own patrons (with respect to maximum time per search session, policy on printer use, availability of staff for assistance, etc.)?

4. Again, assuming that regionals and selectives all receive some allocation of online services usage from LPS:

(a) Should a regional receive an extra increment of online time beyond the amount for which a selective depository is eligible in order to assist the regional in meeting the special demands placed upon its resources?

(b) missing from original--Ed.]

(c) If so, should the use of the extra increment be unrestricted, or should it be reserved for use only in support of reference services provided to other libraries?

(d) Should regionals receive an extra increment of online time to be used only for re-allocation, at the discretion of the regional, to selective depositories in order to supplement the usage allocation that selectives would be eligible to receive directly from LPS?

5. Assuming once more that regionals and selectives all receive some allocation of online services usage from LPS:

(a) Should a regional have the authority to re-allocate online usage from one selective to another, or to itself, if a selective declares that it is willing to relinquish all or part of its usage allocation?

(b) Could such re-allocations be done as open-ended assignments, thus giving selectives with heavy use a way of obtaining on a continuing basis more online time than they could receive directly from LPS? Or would such reallocations be permissible only to help meet emergency needs?

(c) Would selectives within a region be permitted to exchange allocations among themselves, without approval of the regional?

(d) Should a regional have authority to unilaterally adjust allocations of online usage among selectives within the region to better meet the needs of depository patrons?

(e) If a regional would not have such authority in general, would it be able to unilaterally adjust allocations of online usage if it acted according to specific provisions of a state plan or other strategic document that had been endorsed as reflecting a consensus of the depositories in the region?

6. (a) Does GPO have the ability to administer a program that includes differential allocations for online usage?

(b) Does GPO have the ability to administer a program that involves transferable allocations of online usage?

(c) Would LPS maintain timely data on online usage allocations and on actual use?

(d) Would regionals have access to usage records for depositories within their regions? Would selectives within the region have the same right of access?

7. The following questions relate to guidelines and inspection criteria, which will be separately addressed by the Council. The questions are posed here because they might emerge as significant only if regionals are given sole or joint responsibility for the disposition of online usage allocations within the region.

(a) Is an allocation of subsidized online usage provided by GPO to be considered U.S. Government property?

(b) Will the Depository Inspection Program audit the disposition of online usage allocations?

(c) If so, will regional and selective depositories be burdened with additional record-keeping requirements?

Appendix A

Comments Received From the Depository Library Community Relating to Question 2 (a)

(Includes Comments Received through October 8, 1991)

1. Ms. Lily Wai, Documents Librarian at the University of Idaho Library, a regional depository, left a message on the Federal Depository Library Program Bulletin Board System on Aug. 26, 1991 which included the following comment:

Offering online access to regional libraries would be a logical place to start, but it should not be mandatory for all regionals in the beginning until the regionals are equipped and trained to do the job. The allocation of the limited free access time should be equally offered to those regionals that volunteer to participate in the online access service.

2. Mr. Byron V. Whitney, Head of Bibliographic Control at the Clarkson University Educational Resources Center, a selective depository, wrote in a letter dated September 5, 1991 that regional libraries should be given a higher volume of free online services, and that they should have to provide mediated access to online databases for both depository and nondepository libraries in the region.

Mr. Whitney also advocates the selection of online services by selective depositories via LPS 's present-day tools of surveys and the annual item printout.

He further suggests that each selective be given an equal amount of free access initially. That amount would be adjusted upward or downward each year according to the library's usage the previous year and subject to the overall ceiling on the amount of free usage available. Regional libraries would have their time adjusted each year in a similar manner.

Mr. Whitney concludes that it would be a use it or lose it system providing additional free time to those libraries that demonstrate a real need through use.

3. Mr. Steve Hayes of the University of Notre Dame Library, a selective depository, commented as follows in a letter dated Sept. 18, 1991:

Regionals are not necessarily better at providing needed service to the public than many selectives. Requirements on what services a Regional WILL provide are non-existent. Therefore there is wide discrepancy in the caliber of regionals. There are also classes of depositories; some perform well in serving, others do very little but house what is distributed. Not all libraries will want electronic information. Access should go equally to all willing to perform the required services.

4. Ms. Betsy Richmond of the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire Library, a selective depository, placed a message on GovDoc-L on Oct. 1, 1991 which included a statement to the effect that all depositories should have equal access to online products, at least initially.

Note: Other comments relating to Question 2(a) that have been posted on GovDoc-L will be distributed to Council members prior to the start of the fall meeting.

---

## Discussion Paper 2(b)
Submitted by Sandy Morton

### *Question*

Should GPO offer a higher volume of online access to libraries with programs for broad public access? If so, what criteria should be used to evaluate public access?

Before these questions are examined I wish to note that they will be discussed from the perspective of a non-practicing documents librarian and should be viewed in that light. I have received enlightening and insightful comments from members of the depository documents community who have a working knowledge of the issues to be discussed at the Fall 1991 Depository Library Council meeting.

I'm concerned about the questions that have been posed for consideration in this paper. It seems that all of the questions the Depository Library Council members are being asked to consider here are actually "putting the cart before the horse. There are larger and more wide-ranging issues for GPO to consider in terms of accessing government information in all formats. GPO, in conjunction with Congress, including but not limited to the Joint Committee on Printing, the House Subcommittee on Printing and Procurement and the Appropriations Committees, must determine what the rules of the game are.

Some have argued that GPO has statutory authority under Title 44 *U.S.C.* to disseminate all government information regardless of the format in which it is stored. GPO's General Counsel opinions in 1982 and 1989 provided different answers to this question. Another opinion in 1990 does expand the definition of a government publication to include government information presented in an electronic format. Does this, however, provide a definitive response? Can GPO afford to embark on new programs in the area of electronic information without a clear-cut mission to do so?

And if GPO does forge ahead in this area, how will agencies be convinced/mandated to provide information they produce-- not just in electronic formats-- to depositories? There still is no definitive answer to this question.

Deciding whether large or small, regional or selective libraries will receive some or all electronic products and services is not necessarily what should be asked at the starting point. These are certainly policy issues to consider, but the groundwork must be laid and GPO's authority in this area must be set forth.

It would be well for the Council members, new and old, to examine the alternatives developed for the depository library program in the 1988 Office of Technology Assessment report *Informing the Nation*. It is noteworthy that all of the members of the Council have received a copy of that report from GPO. However, two weeks before a meeting is not much time to digest the contents of a more than 300 page report, if one had not had the opportunity to read it previously.

If one mission of the Depository Library Council is to advise the public printer on how to move the depository library program into the next century, then our role must be to work with GPO in looking at the big picture and examine the major policy issues. These include: the role of the depository library program in the electronic age and how to convince Congress to adequately fund GPO/DLP so that electronic products and services are an integral part of the depository program.

In looking at the question before us, it must be asked how to define broad public access? Should it be defined merely by the sheer number of transactions. Libraries in less populated areas have the same level of service available to their public as the ones in urban areas. The number of requests may be less in the rural areas, but the needs of the public are the same. (1)

In essence, those libraries in smaller rural areas or those in a less populated area may be defined as providing broad public access, since they could be the only library serving a whole community.

Politically, there could be problems with choosing certain libraries to receive a higher volume of online access. Congressional pressure could be brought to bear on GPO for choosing (or not choosing) a depository within a Representative's own district. While certain libraries were chosen to participate in the electronic pilot projects, these were only to be studied and were not permanent programs. We should not have Congressional preferences determine which libraries receive access to online services.

Some other comments received on this question include:

GPO should not offer a higher volume of free access to online services to libraries with programs for broad public access.

Rather, the allocation should be based on the same philosophy which governs the distribution of traditional depository materials. Namely, selective depositories choose to receive those items for which they have a perceived need and can support by providing the required facilities and public access. (2)

Besides the regionals, online free access time should also be offered to selective depositories. The selection can be based on what were used in the Economic Bulletin Board and DOE pilot projects if the survey reports on these pilot projects prove they are fair and workable. (3)

Where regionals cannot easily serve their entire constituency, they should not be considered the primary recipient of subsidized service. (4)

In terms of criteria to evaluate public access, the opinions include: The number of terminals and PCs, hours open, staff resources, number of resources. These criteria should be spelled out and be representative of many types of libraries, small, large, academic and private. Perhaps the resources allocated by library administrations should be influenced by the probability of a library receiving subsidies, i.e. cost sharing. What are the criteria used to determine which libraries are selected for pilot projects? Random selection may not best serve the needs of FDLP to determine use.(5)

There should be specific standards by which depositories must operate with regard to service to electronic formats. Criteria should include: equipment on site, reference support (i.e. user assistance in mounting, accessing, printing and downloading information), printing, size of user population served, availability of dial access, number of hours of access, indexing and other technical/ software support, and librarian support for various functions such as extraction, manipulation, etc.(6)

Other issues raised in terms of GPO provision of electronic products and services are:

- Where will user support come from? Agencies or GPO?

- Remember the depositories of the west coast; information should be accessible for all, not just 9-5 on the east coast.

- How will GPO/DLP get NREN policy makers to utilize the depositories?

- What is the GPO position on the WINDO bill? Can GPO provide the services called for in the legislation?

- The depository library program and its users are GPO's constituents. What role will they have in examining alternatives for the future of the depository library program in the electronic age?

- If a strategic plan for the GPO is being examined and discussed, how will the DLC be part of that process?

- What type of cooperation will there be between the DLC and the IWGPO advisory committee?

NOTES

(1) Response from Lily Wai, Documents Librarian, University of Idaho, August 26, 1991.

(2) Response from Byron Whitney, Head Bibliographic Control, Clarkson University (Potsdam, New York), September 6, 1991.

(3) Response from Lily Wai.

(4) Response from Mary Martin, Head, Government Publications and Microforms Department, Claremont College (Claremont, California), September 19, 1991.

(5) Response from Mary Martin.

(6) Response from Stephen Hayes, Reference and Public Documents Librarian, University of Notre Dame, September

18, 1991.

## Discussion Paper 2(c)
Submitted by Susan E. Tulis

### *Question*

This question deals with how a limited amount of free use by depository libraries to an online service or bulletin board should be allocated.

Should GPO avoid duplicative dissemination to those depository libraries who already have online access through another source in order to make more time available to libraries that do not have an alternative? If so, how should this be accomplished? If not, why not?

I would like to preface my remarks by reminding all parties involved that 44 *U.S.C.* 1902 states that Government publications, except those determined by their issuing components to be required for official use only or for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have not public interest or educational value and publications classified for reasons of national security, shall be made available to depository libraries through the facilities of the Superintendent of Documents for public information. I would also add the statement in the GPO General Counsel's opinion dated December 17, 1990, which states that "Government information presented in an electronic format constitutes a Government publication within the meaning of 44 *U.S.C.* S1901".

Thus stated, I will now attempt to answer the question posed. In light of the statements in the previous paragraph, my response to the question is ABSOLUTELY NOT. In fact, this question should not even be asked and suggests that GPO is seeking a means to shirk their responsibilities delineated in Title 44. A library's ability or inability to receive information from another source should not preclude or be included as a criteria for depository library dissemination. If it was, GPO would have to adhere to the same procedure for materials disseminated in paper and microfiche. If a depository library purchases the Congressional hearings and committee prints on microfiche from a private vendor, does that give GPO the right to avoid duplicative dissemination to a depository library as a means to free up funding/or copies to depository libraries that have similar access to that information from an alternative source but chose not to utilize that alternative source? I think not.

What constitutes an alternative source? Is it an equivalent online service or bulletin board? Does equivalent mean exactly the same as produced by the issuing agency or GPO? What if the alternative source has some, but not all of the information as that available through GPO to the depository library-- does that count as an alternative source? Who is to make the determination as to an equivalent product?

The only way I would say yes to this question is if the equivalent product and access to it were exactly the same. That is, the cost to the depository library for access through the alternate source has to be the same as it would be through GPO. The information accessible through both systems has to be exactly the same. Equipment requirements for the depository has to be exactly the same, etc. Assuming all of that, then we can proceed to the next likely scenario.

If all things are equal, it may be likely that the depository library would chose to not select the service through GPO because they were already receiving the information from another source. In fact, this is already happening in the print arena and there is a strong likelihood of this occurring in the electronic arena as well.

For example, there are some agency manuals that are not selected by depository libraries because a) they already purchase it from a commercial source, and b) there is a better chance that depository libraries will get all the necessary updates and transmittals from the private sector source as opposed to GPO. Claims to GPO run the risk of being returned "claims copies

exhausted", whereas, in the private sector, all such materials would be received.

Another example might be that a depository library decides not to gain access to the State Department's (actually Agriculture's) CIDS System produced by the Martin Marietta Corporation because they can gain access through another private vendor (i.e. LEXIS). Many law libraries opt for this alternative. Granted, law school libraries are in a slightly more unique situation than other depository libraries since a large amount of government information is available through LEXIS or WESTLAW, the online legal databases. However, law school libraries cannot solely rely on these two sources for all government information nor can they rely on them to service the needs of the general public. The contractual obligations with these two private vendors preclude the use of these services by the general public. As a consequence, law school libraries must have available information disseminated by GPO to fulfill their legal obligations as defined in Title 44 as well as fulfill their obligations as outlined in the "Guidelines for Depository Libraries".

Many law school libraries have for some time in their item selections opted not to receive a paper or fiche product from GPO because they have access to that same information through the legal databases. But they do this if it is something that, to the best of their determination, the general public accesses very infrequently. Additionally, some selective libraries are located in close proximity to their Regional Depositories which allows them greater latitude in their item selection abilities.

Suppose we do avoid duplicative dissemination-- how is GPO going to monitor what alternative sources depository libraries have access to? Will LPS create an inventory or database and update it periodically as to what alternative electronic services and bulletin boards each of the 1400 depositories subscribe to? This is likely an impossible task for LPS. As an alternative, one would have to rely on each depository to supply GPO with that information. If an item is not selected by a depository library, would you then require that library to list a reason on the item selection sheets as to why they did not select an online service or bulletin board?

There are a number of reasons why I do not think this should be done. First and foremost, the allocation of free access, even a limited amount, should be based on the same criteria that governs the distribution of traditional depository materials. Namely, selective depositories should be able to select and receive those materials for which they have a perceived need and can support by providing the required facilities and public access. It is not fair to penalize those libraries which can afford to subscribe to online service and/or bulletin board. As I have previously discussed, law schools have to subscribe and pay for access to particular legal databases. Should they be penalized because of that? There may be other reasons why a library purchases a similar information product that is also available through the depository library program. The private sector alternative may have more bells and whistles, or include other information on the database that is more highly in demand. A library might be required to purchase a service because of a small portion of the online service, the rest of which duplicates that being disseminated by GPO.

It is fallacious to assume that distribution through the depository library program supplements what a library already has. That is not the intent nor reason for the depository library program. For this very reason I find this question moot.

There are other, more important, matters which need to be addressed such as what happens once we have libraries selecting an online service and the free use of time is divided up evenly? Should there be someone monitoring the amount of use by each selecting library after a specified period of time, say 6 months, to see if all libraries are utilizing their free time? Does it matter? Should those who are not utilizing the free time be given less time the following year? Should whatever free time remaining at the end of the year be divided among those who have exhausted their allocation of free time? How should any remaining free time be divided? How is all of this going to be monitored? Should only those libraries who have the necessary equipment gain access to a particular service or be allowed access to that service? How will this be monitored? Will you have to apply each year and demonstrate a real need for the service (and what constitutes and defines real need)? How will all of this be promoted?

Finally, where does NREN fit into all of this? How about the use of Internet as an alternative means of providing free or low cost access to an online service? Will the GPO WINDO bill, if passed, negate this entire question? Don't Title 44 and the

General Counsel's opinion of delivery of electronic information render this question moot?

## Discussion Paper 3A
Submitted by BJ Swartz, with Anne Diamond

### Question 3

Since it's often more difficult for the public to use the new electronic information sources, how should the criteria to be an "electronic depository library be different than the criteria to be a traditional depository library?

Before jumping directly into section A specifically, we should consider for discussion the concept of a depository institution in the electronic age.

The book, or the printed word, will always be with us; and the distribution of free printed materials (including microforms) to traditional depository libraries should always be part of the Federal Depository Library Program. Libraries choosing to select only print/microform information remain, and will continue to be, an integral part of the program.

Electronic information is appearing, rapidly and in an increasing amount, in the program. A case can be made for treating electronic information as no different from print/microform and for casting it into the program to sink-or-swim. After all, libraries selected microfiche and provided fiche readers to access the information; there is no difference. But electronic information brings with it far more demanding requirements in equipment, software needs, user assistance and staff training. It is one thing to purchase a fiche reader and show someone how to put in the microfiche and read or print it. It is something quite different to purchase at least one CD-ROM workstation that will be required to run a variety of software (as yet not standardized), learn how to use the software and train both staff and users on it, maintain the hardware, and still be prepared to be asked for access before the information has even arrived.

Given the complexity of both the hardware and software, the expertise and staff time needed, and the higher level of user support needed to provide electronic information on an equitable basis to the public, perhaps there should be separate criteria for selection and/or participation in an electronic program. If a traditional depository library has the equipment, the expertise, and the willingness, it should by all means select CD-ROM, floppy disks, or whatever format rears its ugly head in the future.

What we may need to consider is another category of depository library, or rather depository institution. If information centers, for example State Data Center lead agencies or university computer centers, are willing to accept the responsibilities of providing government information under Title 44, they should be able to join the program as "electronic depositories".

Services of computer centers and libraries are overlapping more and more. With the amount of government information becoming available in electronic format, the expertise of the computer center would make it an excellent candidate for participation in the depository system. Magnetic tape could well be included in the program. User support for CD-ROM and diskette would come from personnel already accustomed to providing assistance in using computer products.

State data centers are already providing a high level of user support and training. Including them in the program could only benefit the Depository Library System.

### Question 3a

How should the guidelines and inspection criteria be updated to incorporate changes resulting from the inclusion of electronic information in the Federal Depository Library Program?

Participation in the Federal Depository Library Program carries with it responsibility for housing and providing access to

government information. The guidelines and inspection criteria provide a framework or basis for a library's policies and procedures regarding government information.

Given the current limitations of Title 44, GPO is attempting to treat electronic information as it would paper or microfiche. Just as a library should have a microfiche reader if it is going to select fiche, if it is going to select electronic information, it should have the resources to at least mount the software and make it available to anyone savvy enough to use it. If the library cannot provide access to the electronic information, it should either not select it or select it and establish a selective housing agreement with some place that can.

Guidelines:

The guidelines need to become more flexible regarding format of government information. Currently, terminology includes publication and document, specified as in paper or microformat. The focus needs to shift to information, regardless of format, so as to encompass print (paper and microform) and electronic (CD-ROM, diskette, audio/videotapes, computer tapes, and the infamous - (whatever comes next) products.

References to microform equipment and storage need to be broadened to reflect and encompass new technology. Minimum Technical Guidelines should be appended and should be reviewed and revised annually. Similarly Minimum Staff Competency Guidelines should be developed and appended to encourage staff to keep pace with new developments.

Inspection Criteria:

Depository libraries are inspected using seven criteria, with an eighth for regionals. Electronic information impacts on all of these. Currently, extra credit is given for having a CD-ROM reader and a microcomputer. Including minimum technical guidelines as a part of the criteria is, needless to say, becoming necessary as a condition for libraries choosing to select electronic products, providing that the guidelines are reviewed and revised annually and ample notice is given before any change in the inspection criteria takes effect.

Collection Development:

Format should be at the discretion of the library. It is important to reiterate, however, that there is usually a distinct difference between a print/microform title and an electronic product with the same name. It is the responsibility of both GPO and the library to be aware of this and to see that selection criteria are clear for these titles: the electronic product may or may not replace the printed product.

Just as when selecting print materials, information in electronic format should be selected with regard to the needs of the congressional district, the library's clientele, etc.

Bibliographic Control:

Libraries are finally becoming more adept at cataloging electronic materials, something that computer centers, in their own fashion, have been doing for some time. A MARC format exists and should be used to include electronic products in the library's bibliographic control system.

Procedure manuals should reflect any additional steps for electronic products, such as processing, staff training, etc.

Maintenance:

If a microfiche is lost, or destroyed, a copy can be easily and inexpensively obtained. If a CD-ROM is lost or destroyed, replacement can be expensive or impossible. Libraries will need to obtain processing and storage equipment (engravers, plastic

protection overlays, cleaning materials, labels, filing cabinets, security devices, backup disks for diskettes) for electronic media.

Human Resources:

Electronic information brings with it additional responsibility for staff training, user instruction, and user assistance. A standard should be developed to look at additional staff needed to adequately work with patrons when CD-ROM and databases are provided. It is important to look at what arrangements are made, if any, to deal with peak times of public service.

In order to maintain an informed public, the depository would ideally have at least one staff person proficient in using, maintaining, and providing assistance with electronic products. Difficult decisions must be made, both at GPO and in the depositories, about user support and the staffing needed to provide it. Minimum Staff Competency Guidelines should be established and become an important part of the inspection criteria.

Physical Facilities:

One hundred people can use one hundred volumes of paper documents at the same time. If one copy of each CD-ROM is available to be used on one workstation, only one person can use one copy of one CD-ROM at any one time. There must be sufficient equipment for users to access electronic data without having to wait an inordinate amount of time in a queue. Along with minimum technical guidelines, there should be a standard of sufficient equipment considering the user population and the size of the electronic collection.

Public Service:

Depositories need to balance staff, group instruction, individual instruction, handouts/guides, and turning the user loose to sink or swim. Electronic products require more time for user assistance and instruction. Decisions must be made and policies developed regarding levels of support, including hours of varying support levels.

Inspection criteria should include 1) whether user instruction and instructional materials are prepared for electronic products; 2) policies regarding usage times, downloading, printing, etc.; 3) equitable access to all citizens of the congressional district; 4) outreach and marketing, including electronic services; 5) referrals to neighboring libraries with more technical products or more skilled professionals.

Cooperative Efforts:

Cooperation is the core of the Federal Depository Library Program. For a more traditional depository, selective housing of electronic information would be a positive factor in the inspection. If a super depository or an electronic depository structure were put in place, some alteration would have to occur for this category, depending on the type of institution.

Regional Services:

Regionals need to show that they are coordinating - if not providing - technical assistance, continuing education, and referrals to assist selectives in dealing with electronic media.

Conclusion:

In today's rapidly changing, high tech society, the Federal Depository Library Program needs to become more flexible in both its structure and its administration. Conversely, it needs to be rigid in its demand for quality. Without some flexibility, combined with strict quality control, free access for all to government information is jeopardized. In examining the impact of the information age on the criteria for the electronic depository, we must, above all, consider the depository's role in maintaining an informed public.

It is important to remember that electronic information should not be selected for its own sake, but rather for its value to the public. Print information is still valuable and necessary, as is the role of the traditional depository library.

Looking at the role of the electronic depository, we should seriously consider it as a separate, perhaps overlapping, unit of the Federal Depository Library Program. There is a role for a fully electronic depository, in that it would be dedicated to electronic information and should have the facilities to provide a wide range of user support. There is also a role for the depository combining traditional and electronic information, with a user support varying as widely as the institutions in the program and their populations.

Flexible, but demanding, guidelines and inspection criteria provide a framework for policies and procedures in depositories, and ultimately a cornerstone for their ability to fulfill their role of providing free access to government information for all.

## Discussion Paper 3b
Submitted by Teresa Marquez and Anne Diamond

### *Question*

How will electronic information impact or affect standards for public access?

The Depository Library Council adopted the "Minimum Standards for the Depository Library System" to assist library administrators and librarians in their support of government publications collections that are responsive to the information needs of the communities served. Presently, these standards are being affected by the introduction of new electronic technologies in depository libraries and will continue to be affected in the foreseeable future as technological applications alter the generation and dissemination of government information. This has directly impacted budgets, services, personnel and users. Moreover, current economic conditions have impacted the standards, creating inequities in the access of information. Libraries with means manage to keep abreast of new advancements while other libraries struggle to maintain present levels of access, and still others are unable to integrate new developments into their operations. Then, libraries face the challenge of continuing public access to information and minimizing the erosion of access standards. Toward that aim, as libraries strive to remain responsive to the information needs of their users, libraries need to select and maintain collections in electronic formats and to organize electronic information in a manner that insures efficient and timely public access. Also, libraries will need to provide access to information disseminated on-line only and to arrange for its organization and storage for future use. Associated with public access is the question of reference services. Discussions on levels of service in an electronic environment have appeared in The Electronic Corner in recent issues of *Administrative Notes*. Essentially, library policies determine levels of service. And while reference staffs may be expected to be thoroughly conversant with specific electronic formats, to give high levels of service, the same standards are not required for all electronic products. Nor are staff members expected to give specialized assistance, as in data management. Moreover, instructional assistance in the use of software packages and microcomputers may vary, accordingly. The hiring and training of personnel to select, organize and provide access to electronic information in a timely manner, provision of sufficient space for workstations, and for storage, in good condition, of electronic information require a significant commitment from depository libraries. The introduction of electronic information has created an information chasm among depository libraries and inequities in public access to government information. This issue and other issues of concern need to be addressed more fully. For now, several observations are offered and briefly analyzed below:

Collection Development:

Of the 18 basic collection titles, a library should select the titles in one, or more formats, if offered, but format should be at the discretion of the library.

Materials in electronic format should be selected which meet the needs of the congressional district, the library's clientele,

etc. Ex: If a library has a nursing program, the National Health Interview Survey would be a candidate for selection. Libraries should be aware of other electronic products available at neighboring institutions.

Bibliographic Control:

Electronic materials should be captured in the bibliographic control system of the library as are other formats. This would include electronic databases. (It would help those libraries that copy GPO's cataloging if GPO were more timely.)

Procedure manuals should reflect additional steps for CD's such as processing, then sending to the information systems staff, then on to public services for staff training, etc.

Maintenance:

As CD-ROM becomes more "mainstreamed," library suppliers are selling more processing materials for this medium: engravers, plastic protection overlays, cleaning materials, labels, filing cabinets, in addition to security level jewel boxes. The literature also recommends installing security measures on pc's for hard disks to prevent theft and/or power surges.

Human Resources:

Once the capital outlay for equipment and software are made, the greatest impact of electronic products on the library appears to be staffing. Some standard, similar to the Shearer Measure, should be developed to look at additional staff needed to adequately work with patrons when CD-ROM and databases are provided. It is important to look at what arrangements are made, if any, to deal with peak times of public service. Also a new category of staff should be examined: information systems support.

Physical Facilities:

CD's do not appear to require any particular climate control, but do require special handling or little handling. CD-equipment (including filing cabinets or carousels) should be sufficient for those CD's selected. Sufficient printers should also be available.

Public Service:

More time is spent with patrons in training for use of electronic products. This equates to more staff. Other things to look for include what instructional/bibliographic instruction or guide materials are prepared for electronic products? What policies regarding usage times, downloading, print, etc., are in place: do not prohibit or discourage use by all citizens of the congressional district and are clearly visible? What outreach to market the new or newly formatted services exists? What referrals are made to neighboring libraries with more technical products or more skilled professionals?

Cooperative Efforts:

The present evaluation would suffice. If a super depository library structure were put in place, some alteration would have to occur for this category, depending on the type of library.

Regional Services:

If regionals are not providing the technical assistance selectives need to meet this new medium, what continuing education or referral system is in place to assist selectives?

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

# 1992

# Depository Library Council Recommendations and Responses

## Spring Meeting, April 28, 1992 • Washington, DC

**Topics To Be Discussed**

**Topic I: Structure of the Interface and Its Implications**

**I. Structure of the GPO Electronic Interface**

**A. Gateway to agency databases**

i. Major Advantages

    a. One point of access--one phone no., etc. for users to know.

    b. One interface with instructions on how to access the files of the different agencies.

    c. Direct access to full files rather than subsets.

ii. Problems

    a. Would require a large number of access ports provide access for a large number of simultaneous users.

    b. Each agency is likely to have different database management systems, access protocols, log ons, security, etc. There would need to be some user assist to get through these. See lb, above.

    c. Agency databases may not be formatted for easy end user access. Librarians will have to become familiar with the structure and access methods for many of these databases.

    d. May require substantial GPO investment.

    e. Will require close cooperation between GPO and the agencies.

**B. Enhanced value of GPO databases**

i. Potential conflict with the traditional role of the private sector.

ii. Need to find a way to provide useful databases- a certain amount of value adding is necessary--without interfering with the role of the private sector.

    a. GPO should not be limited to distribution of raw data. Even preparing a book organizes the material and adds contents, indexes, and probably some description or analysis. No reason there shouldn't be an equivalent of value added for electronic information.

    b. User friendly front end software a minimum.

    c. Find ways to exploit electronic technology to improve document access for users in ways that might be different from print technology.

d. But leave room for the private sector take it further.

## C. Alternative means of Access

(Note: issues raised under one alternative may also apply to one or more of the others.)

i. Internet/NREN

a. Internet is becoming an increasingly important means of communication in the U.S. Traffic on the Internet doubles every six months.

b. Access

> 1) Academic libraries tend to have access.

> 2) Public libraries, school libraries, state, court and county libraries, and other kinds of libraries mostly do not now have access. It may be possible in the future for them to obtain connections through their state and local networks.

> 3) Need for expanded means of public access to the Internet.

> 4) Hardware configuration required--does the standard hardware platform approved by Council, in the spring of 1991 meet the need. Probably yes. FTP file transfer through the Internet will permit access to and direct delivery of documents.

c. Cost

1) Cost to G.P.O. to become a node on the network. Probably not a great deal of money involved. More money will be involved if the decision is made to develop large databases that are stored and maintained at G.P.O.

> a) Hardware costs, etc.

> b) Cost of providing user support to libraries.

2) Cost to individual libraries to get access to the Internet, if they have not already done so.

3) Cost of data storage at GPO

4) Cost of storing downloaded data in the local library. Libraries may not have sufficient disk space to store large quantities of data locally.

> a) Storage off-line, on disks, etc.

> b) Storage online.

> c) Cost of providing user assistance to the downloaded information.

> d. Service programs for depository users of electronic information.

> > 1) Will data be stored at G.P.O. for remote access and downloading or will it be sent on a list to those who have selected the item?

2) What kind of assistance will be needed?

3) Need for directory of databases available over the internet.

4) How will librarians be trained? - Local libraries may not have the technical talent needed to access, download, manipulate data and deal with the technical problems.

5) Will depository library users be allowed to access the system directly, or will there always have to be a librarian intermediary?

e. Political issues

1) Financial or political constraints could delay building or implementation of the NREN.

ii. Telephone Networks

a. Capability to handle large volumes of data in reasonable amounts of time--9600 baud is too slow for the volumes under consideration here.

b. Cost 5 issues

1) Will depository libraries have access to an 800 number or other means of low cost access?

2) If not, the cost of continuous long distance calling is likely to be prohibitive.

3) How many incoming lines will G.P.O. need to handle the traffic?

c. Accessibility from home, either direct or through the local depository library.

iii. Satellite/Broadcast

a. Advantages

1) High speed data transmission

2) Most cost effective for GPO

b. Access issues

1) Few libraries have this capability now.

2) What arrangements would have to be made to share information received by the libraries with the equipment with those libraries that do not have the equipment - Does this imply a multitiered structure for the Depository program?

3) Would such libraries receive some Federal aid to help them carry out that function?

c. Broadcast implies large quantities of data will be received and stored in the library.

1) Implications

2) Cost

3) Service

d. Technical requirements on both ends.

    1) Computer, antenna (probably a small dish), radio receiver or transmitter, interface device.

    2) Cost to G.P.O. and the library to set up appropriate stations. Could some of the local costs be supported with Federal dollars to get over the initial barriers?

    3) Standards--Need to follow appropriate standard protocols for data transmission.

iv. Comments on SEND, FIND, INTERACI

    a. Three part program accepts affirmative responsibility for disseminating government information in electronic form--we approve.

    b. However, a lot is unspecified.

        1) some of these have been alluded to above-see comments under satellite broadcast, etc.

        2) FIND--A universal finding device for government information would be very useful.

    a) But, is there a turf battle here - OMB has been charged to do this for years and has failed; NTIS is now supposed to be working on a feasibility study to do this under the National High Technology Pre-Eminence Act; it looks like the charge to GPO to produce the *Monthly Catalog*; and NARA and LC may also have some interests here.

    b) Review McClure studies for recommendations.

3) SEND--See discussions above on Internet and Satellite Distribution

4) INTERACI--

    a) A database in house at GPO will meet a real, important need for those people who don't acquire the information routinely under SEND, and for members of the general public.

    b) The ease of use of the system will be critical to its success. User friendly software, good commitment to user support.

Submitted by: Bob Oakley, Miriam Drake, Sioux Plummer

## Topic 2: Types and Specific Databases for Loading on the Internet

### *What are the criteria for choosing which databases are loaded first and which one(s) should be chosen?*

The choice should guarantee an early success for GPO and the agency sponsor. GPO may need to select an agency that is both willing and well-heeled, in addition to having a product that is already up and running. Also, there might be candidate products already on the Internet. If so, they should be among the first in line.

The choice should be of a product that is simple to access and manipulate. Is network access to a CD-ROM (using GPO as a file server) less technically challenging than access to a bulletin board?

User priorities should be taken into account. ALA published a list of priority databases when WINDO was introduced, and GODORT recently named its top 10 (attached).

GPO's current priorities should be taken into account. GPO is aiming to have the *Congressional Record* on line by the end of FY 1993. The Internet initiative probably needs a success sooner than a year and a half from now.

Recommendation: Choose a high library priority, lower-tech database of a manageable size, published by a cooperative agency. Cendata and *NTDB* would be two logical choices. Also, GPO may be interested in loading the *Monthly Catalog*, and the incentive for cooperation, investment and success certainly exists in that instance.

## *How would additional databases be chosen?*

A complete plan may have to await the formal establishment of the "gateway" and experience with the early experiments, so libraries can judge how much technical support is required to service a particular type of database and whether it is being provided.

Nevertheless, the next databases ought to be the top priority ones chosen from the top 10 list in an order which takes into account the other criteria listed above. More importantly, GPO should set up implementation teams, with representation from (at least) the sponsoring agency, GPO, and one or more user libraries. The number of databases loaded will be limited only by the number of teams GPO can set up. Obviously, the *Federal Register* should, if possible, head the list. As above, since GPO will be converting the *Congressional Record*, it would also be a likely candidate.

The team building/selection process should be an open one. Possibly, an agency/GPO/DL coordinating council for Internet access should be formed to work on choosing target databases and on setting up individual implementation teams.

## *What outreach activities should GPO undertake?*

Why is outreach necessary? The success of the Internet initiative will require large-scale cooperative efforts. Agencies (as well as libraries) need to feel they are part of the process, especially since they will have to invest their own time and, possibly, money. In many cases, agencies have satisfied their legislative or mission mandates by developing and opening their bulletin boards or CD-ROM programs. Who and how many use them is less critical.

GPO makes much of its visits to agencies by which it purportedly keeps track of agency activities and issues and lets agencies know about GPO and its services. Some observers believe these outreach efforts are highly selective, principally to the traditional high- volume producers. Outreach for the Internet initiative should be much more open and better focused. A public call to all agencies who produce electronic products offering the opportunity for Internet distribution to the nationwide DL system could be done through the Internet, should generate a number of agency responses, particularly from those with less visible and well-known (but not necessarily less valuable) products.

Another good vehicle for outreach and feedback would be a "GPO on the Internet" newsletter, both in paper and electronic forms. It could be one of the products on the Internet, either freestanding or as a file on the LPS bulletin board. In addition to telling agencies and libraries about the status of product conversion, it could solicit information about, and publicize, new agency electronic products and services. It could also serve as an opinion forum.

An additional vehicle is the open meeting (like the April 6 meeting of the FPC's Electronic Dissemination Roundtable - see page 6) or conference. The Federal Depository Conference could be recast as a user/provider conference; or, a periodical "GPO on the Internet" conference or seminar might be a worthwhile investment.

Submitted by: John Weiner, Susan Tulis, Janet Fisher

GPO WINDO

Database Wish List

GODORT

Priority Title

Agricola
ATFI (Federal Maritime Commission)
5 Bill Digest
Budget
4 Cendata
CIDS (Agriculture, Dept. of State)
3 *Code of Federal Regulations*
8 *Commerce Business Daily*
7 *Congressional Record*
EASE (Navy procurement)
2 Economic Bulletin Board
EDGAR
ERIC
*Energy Research Abstracts* (DOE)
*Federal Acquisition Regulations*
FTC Campaign Contributions
1 *Federal Register*
FDA Bulletin Board
FOIA databases
9 *GPO Monthly Catalog*
Hermes
Juris (Dept. of Justice)
Labstat (Dept. of Justice)
Library of Congress Scorpio System Medline
NASA Star System
NCJRS (National Criminal Justice Reference Service)
6 *NTIS Research Abstracts*
10 *National Trade Data Bank*
PTO Automated Patent System
*Toxic Release Inventory*
Tox Line

## Topic 3: Benefits

Our colleague on the Depository Library Council, Bob Oakley, made a number of good points in his letter to Janet Fisher following the Council's teleconference in January. Bob stated that:

- "The purpose of the depository program in general is to benefit the nation

- it promotes the accountability of government by making information about the government and its work available to

the citizens at large

- it makes useful information available to individuals, farmers, and entrepreneurs

- it makes information available to scholars and researchers in many different disciplines."

Bob went on to discuss the "have-nots" and said: "...it is important not to stop by simply asking the question who would not benefit. Rather, it is important to go on and identify the means by which information can be made available to everyone, whether they have the technology available or not."

## *Who Benefits*

1. Business -- small ones could access information for free or low-cost or could purchase value-added from other organizations.

2. Larger businesses/corporations/vendors/value-added producers -- could obtain information directly from agencies or through the depository system.

3. Education/schools (k-12)--

4. Education/Universities/post-secondary--

5. State/local governments --

6. The public-at-large -- we must examine, closely, how the "public" fits in. They are the missing ingredient. In too many cases, John Q Public is left out in the dark as we examine the stakeholders.

## *Alternatives*

The group made a number of assumptions here.

1. Technology in the Depositories

We cannot assume that all depositories have access to the latest technology. If we assume that there is a "minimum" level of technology which a depository must have, then the small rural and poor urban areas may not be served by the system. If libraries and other institutions became electronic depositories, segments of the public could be underserved. Regionals could be overburdened if the task of disseminating electronic information to the "have-nots" is thrust on them.

2. Networking

The assumption of the committee is that GPO will get on the Internet.

Regional (state, local, etc.) networks vs. the Internet. This question would be moot if the NREN becomes "all it can be." But those answers are a long way off. Where would small libraries fit in? Will they be networked directly? Through universities? Through a federal node? Now, regional/state/local networks offer local, easier, dial-in access. Offer resources sharing, localized information, etc. Can/should GPO work with those networks to get information to those not on Internet?

State Data Centers -- often have dial-up bulletin boards and will distribute electronic information on disk or in printed form for no or low cost.

3. Format

Don't discontinue print format just because electronic information is available. It should not be an either/or situation. How to convince federal agencies not to limit information dissemination to electronic format since segments of the public would be unable to access that information. Should agencies be required to distribute data on as needed/request basis if it's only in electronic format? Should agencies provide information in paper/microfiche? Are we overstepping our charge if we look for a requirement on agencies to go beyond what they would produce for their primary users? If produced only in electronic format, who has the responsibility to provide in other format to end-user? Who pays for this? What is the agency mission? Should GPO be responsible for providing non-electronic information to those libraries/citizens without access to new technology? What is the responsibility of the depository? Should the assumption be that if a library wants to be a depository it has to bear the responsibilities that come with it?

## Publicity/Awareness

1. Marketing --how to get the word out - Is it GPO's responsibility/is it depository libraries' responsibility?

2. Examine the consumer information program (out of Pueblo, CO), look to it as a model

3. How to get information to schools

4. Brief articles placed in appropriate publications--popular magazines, subject oriented. There is a need to examine those untapped areas.

5. TV/radio--what is the "hook", how to make it interesting and newsworthy

6. GPO needs to do more outreach --"traveling road show"

- library meetings (not just ALA and not just sales program), NTIS/DTIC/LC show their "wares" at many of these meetings
- education meetings (NEA, PTA etc.)
- sci-tech meetings ~ media organizations -- let them be aware of what timely and free information is available from depositories
- other "trade" shows
- continue working and networking with federal agencies so that they will know the benefits of cooperating with GPO/DLP

Submitted by: Chris Kitchens, Sandy Morton, BJ Swartz

## Topic 4: Technical Support

Introduction:

As stated in *GPO/2001: Vision for a New Millennium*, "People intuitively know how to access and use printed documents. We [GPO] must strive to make access to, and the use of, electronic documents just as easy". This is the essence of the technical support question. What activities or procedures does GPO need to organize in order for librarians and other depository users to find information in an electronic format as simply as they do by consulting a printed document's table of contents, index, and text? In the past with printed documents, GPO only had to acquire the document, arrange for its printing or microfiching, and distribute the document to the depository community. Distribution of electronic format information cannot follow the

same scenario and be effective because finding information in those electronic products is not the intuitive process it has been with print materials. In order to disseminate information products and services effectively, GPO must focus on the needs of the users of that information. GPO must help them match their information needs with the raw data in electronic format and connect with the technical knowledge, skills, and expertise required to process that raw data into relevant information. Can the traditional role of GPO/LPS as a distributor of publications be philosophically and strategically stretched to include training in use of electronic products and/or development of software products to assist in utilizing electronic formats?

Technical support necessary for effective use of electronic information falls into three main categories: software, human resources, and training/education.

## A. Software

i. User-friendly features

> a. Seamless to user

> b. Command structure should remain the same so that the user does not need to relearn the software with each upgrade

> c. Easy to install

> d. Simple to use in the sense that learning curve is relatively brief and commands are intuitive to those somewhat familiar with other software packages

> e. Ability to download data onto floppy disks

ii. Open file structures permitting various software packages to be utilized with CD-ROM's

Example: With Census CD-ROMs the "go" software allows "entry level" access to data, "EXTRACT" more advanced access, and finally "dBase" provides the most flexibility with the data. Do most depository libraries have the expertise, time, and/or funding to support dBase access and training for patrons? Agency "should" provide minimal level of software access.

iii. Software for network that has the capability to handle all types and formats of information (i.e. text, image, and voice)

iv. Documentation - Printed documentation available for every electronic source

v. Software should provide access to all data on disk

vi. Problem of electronic products such as CD-ROMs arriving with no software; that situation combined with hesitation on the part of some agencies to suggest a software product to use with CD-ROMs because they consider that to constitute a commercial endorsement

vii. Software needed for use with some products can be very expensive . Example: software for use With TIGER Line Files is approximately $2000

viii. Inconsistencies in what type software is shipped - Will depositories be expected to have all varieties and ages of personal computers on hand to be able to use the products? Can GPO assist with reformatting information to usable diskette or can more of a standardization take place? High Density vs. Low Density 3 1/2" diskettes vs. 5 1/4" Related question of obsolescence - Will older diskettes, CD-ROMs become unusable due to upgrades and technological advances in hardware?

## B. *Human Resources*

i. For specific electronic products, where does the buck stop? Is there someone at GPO who will take responsibility for knowing how a particular electronic product can be used, help with bugs, answer questions, etc.? Is it possible to establish a help desk at each agency supplying electronic products so depositories would have a guaranteed contact for questions, assistance? What is the best procedure for assuring continuity in handling and successfully assisting with questions?

ii. Can GPO take responsibility of providing support staff to answer questions on hardware, software, and specific applications?

Example: What are the choices in public domain software that would be appropriate for accessing CD-ROM data at a basic level?

## C. *Training/Education*

i. Workshops need to be given by agency personnel to demonstrate software/CD-ROMs. To help with cost, give priority training to regionals -- then allow regionals to serve as mentors for selectives in their area. The University of New Mexico has given several workshops for other selectives around the state that could be a model for this type of program.

ii. Training Tools

a. Video

    1) Contents, features of the system, types of information offered, demonstration of retrieval process

    2) Distributed to all 1400 depository libraries

    3) Layman language; not library language

b. Demo disk for computer

    1) Similar contents to video demo

    2) Interactive

    3) Available on both 3 1/2" and/or 5 1/4" disk

    4) No copyright restrictions

    5) For use by end user, anywhere

c. "800" number for support.

    1) Use a telephone "tree" format; i.e. push "one" for ..., push "two" for..., etc.

    2) Technical support for librarian, breakdowns,

    3) Information support, where can you find questions, etc.

d. Responsibility for these tools:

      1) GPO staff; all trained in system to respond to "800" number

      2) As part of contractual agreement with software provider, development of video and disk will be included.

iii. Demonstration Library (Libraries)

A number of documents librarians have long believed that one of the reasons some paper products have had problems was because the staff at GPO do not often have occasion to come in direct contact with how the materials are processed, maintained, or used in an actual library setting and therefore, less-appropriate decisions have been made of problems that have occurred because the inconsistencies or problems did not become apparent until the "rubber hit the road" or the "book hit the shelf" as the case may be. There has been no "laboratory" library to serve as a model or reference point. Is it time to rethink this method of operation, especially in regard to electronic information? If not a possible role for GPO, an alternative scenario would be for certain depositories to be designated the "demonstration" or "laboratory" library for specific items. These designees could be called on to be a partner with GPO in decision-making regarding the products in their area; they could be in a position to quickly bring problems to GPO's attention and to work with GPO in constructively finding solutions that could be shared with the depository community at large, diminishing the frustration level for everyone and thereby, improving access to the information; and they could serve as an expert other libraries could call upon for help in applications.

iv. Executive (Expert) Loan Program.

Because electronic products are not intuitive, depository librarians often do not know what possible applications some products have. One regional depository librarian has expressed frustration that the electronic products don't come with "examples" of the types of information available on the products or the applications that various products provide. While examples on paper would be helpful, the greatest example of all would be an "expert" in a depository library who was creating and using applications to meet specific user needs - someone with complete knowledge of the data and software who was given the opportunity to show how the various products could be applied to answer specific needs for information. The expert could be "loaned" to the depository for an afternoon, several days, or several months. While such a program would most likely not be feasible for all depositories, certain depositories could be selected and could then serve as an "expert" who would inform and assist the other libraries in those specific applications. Possible scenarios include:

      1. GPO Expert to Depository Libraries

      2. Agency Expert to Depository Libraries

      3. Industry Expert to Depository Libraries

Submitted by: Teresa Marquez, Beth Duston, Kay Schlueter

GPO and Its Electronic Future

## Topic 5: Risk Assessment

A combination of factors, including the strategic framework outlined in GPO/2001 and the implications inherent in a number of legislative initiatives, have placed GPO at the forefront of electronic dissemination of government information. Indeed,

the previous topics for discussion at this Council meeting have all dealt with ways that GPO could proceed electronically. It must be remembered however, that GPO's efforts in this arena are not universally supported, nor are they viewed as the only viable alternative. For example, as the diverse group of witnesses testifying at a recent subcommittee hearing on "Creative Ways of Using and Disseminating Federal Information" illustrates (see attachment 1), there are a number of vitally interested stakeholders in the dissemination of government information. Additionally, the vagueness of both NREN and the GPO Visions Report have allowed a number of other groups to step forward with their own plans for disseminating government information (see attachment 2 ). The matter is further complicated by an uneasiness among the Depository Library Community on the impact that these changes will have on their ability to receive, store, and service government information. While the "New Vision" is generally applauded by the user community, it is in the best interest of GPO and the DLP to be aware of the potential risks and roadblocks to GPO's electronic future so that they can effectively deal with problems should they arise. Toward that end, the following topics are offered as points of discussion to assist GPO in preparing for the new millennium.

I. Inadequacy of description of type and scope of services under consideration

      A. Vagueness of proposal makes it difficult to garner support from other agencies, Congress or the user community

      B. Cost estimates

            i. To implement the program

            ii. To depository libraries

      C. Potential impact on the Depository Library Program

            i. Service requirements

            ii. Retention/downloading/archiving requirements

            iii. Potential curtailment of dissemination to depository libraries in non-electronic formats

            a. Dissemination to regional libraries

            b. Dissemination to selective libraries

II. Ability of libraries and patrons to use government information in electronic formats

      A. Pilot project evaluations

      B. Cost and usage data on DLP Bulletin Board System

      C. Data on selection of electronic-format items currently available to depository libraries

      D. Library support and patron service issues relating to the type of dissemination service offered by GPO

      i. Electronic distribution to all depository libraries

      ii. Electronic distribution to a selected group of libraries that would act as gateways to other depository libraries

      iii. Depository libraries would access a centralized GPO database much like as they currently access DIALOG or

LEXlS/NEXIS.

E. Ease of use, technical documentation, user support for electronically distributed information

III. Opposition from other providers or recipients of information

A. Impact on non-depository recipients of government information

i. Access

ii. Price

iii. Timeliness

B. Impact on agency dissemination programs

i. Relationship with executive-branch agencies as suppliers of information

ii. NTIS

C. Impact on non-government disseminators of government information

i. Other dissemination proposals

a. Community Learning Network

ii. Private sector

IV. Legislative

A. Authorization

B. Funding

C. Alternative legislative proposals

## *Attachment 1*

One Hundred Second Congress - Congress of the United States - House of Representatives - Government Information, Justice and Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D.C. 20515-5147

**Public Hearing Creative Ways of Using and Disseminating Federal Information**,
Wednesday, February 19, 1992 - 9:30 a.m.,
2203 Rayburn House Office Building

Witness List

Panel I

Jack L. Brock. Jr.
Director, Government Information land Financial Management Information Management and Technology Division

General Accounting Office

Nancy M. Cline
Dean of University Libraries
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA

Linda R. Walters
Director, Information Management Division
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Panel II

Robert A. Simons
General Counsel
Dialog Information Services, Inc.
Palo Alto, CA

Paul P. Massa
President, Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Bethesda, MD

Gail S. Dykstra
Senior Director, Policy and Programs
Canadian Legal Information Centre
Toronto, Canada

### *Attachement 2*

### *The Community Learning Network: A "heads-up" to networkers and educators*

### *EDUCOM K-12 Networking Project* - Last revision: 5 March 1992

Over the past few weeks, a group combining the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (the national office, independent of the local Chambers) and public and private organizations (including the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the FCCSET Committee on Education and Human Resources of the White House's Office of Science and Technology Policy) has come forward to propose a Community Learning Network (CLN).

Their literature describes the CLN as "...a national learning technology and information delivery system that will interconnect the nation's schools and will be financed through 'shared usage' by the public and private sectors." The educational goals of the Community Learning Network are to "empower educators through technology to use new approaches to individualized learning," and to "stimulate community involvement in education."

The eventual goal of this project is to install millions of" American manufactured high-performance computers" in every school in the nation, all of them tied into the Community Learning Network. An open systems design is explicitly mentioned, to "integrate existing networks avoiding duplication of effort."

An estimated $250,000 of equipment is to be placed in school settings in the first part of the project. The equipment will include a satellite (receiving and sending) antenna, coder-decoder, large-format video displays, camera, videodisc, CD-ROM and videotape players, controlling server, and 25 workstations. Funds will also provide for refurbishing a video conferencing

room and a computer lab, along with networking capabilities, janitorial support and maintenance. These resources are to be provided at no charge to the schools; in return, the schools will agree to allow the resources to be used for training and program access by Federal, state, and local governments, and by businesses. Payments from this usage will recoup the investment of local groups in setting up the facilities.

Potential participants in this effort include many government agencies with interest in training, outreach and information dissemination to the general public. To cite a couple of potential examples: any agency of Federal or state government with information to disseminate or records to access could make this information available through the CLN; likewise, any group needing to train in the local area (for instance, a state agricultural program or an insurance company) can set up a video conference or download a program that could be viewed in evenings or weekends. Modem access by local dial-up is promised, so that mail and text resources could be accessed from anywhere in the local community. The Chamber of Commerce, with its local, regional and state chapters, is obviously a potentially powerful device for stimulating the partnerships that would drive the installation of these systems in the community. Note that such systems could be located in the public library or the city council building as well as in the schools.

...Regarding the CLN, two questions that come to my mind are: how would such a resource be worked into the K-l2 classroom - specifically, how would matches between resources and curriculum be made to grow and thrive? And how would the existence of a CLN fit that is going on now in the growth of the Internet and NREN? For example, there are a number of community development approaches being tried, some of which are on the Internet; why not integrate the CLN hardware with the community development viewpoint of, say, Big Sky Telegraph or the FreeNet/National Public Telecommunications Network approach?

The project is under active development at present, with a good deal of excitement about it in some policy quarters in Washington. Many details of implementation, including some critical technical ones, remain sketchy in the information publicly available.

What is clear is that the group developing this initiative is very actively looking for funding sources and collaborators. It appears that the Computing Sciences Technology office (CSTO) of the Defense Advanced Projects Research Agency (DARPA) has awarded funding to the Chamber of Commerce for the Community Learning Network; the amount is not known but the FY 1993 Administration budget request introduced last January contains $40 million for the CLN.EDUCOM has been approached by the principals in this effort to see if we would collaborate with them. Possible areas of collaboration include brokering connections with the postsecondary education community, and developing links between the CLN and NREN systems and resources.

This information was summarized from an email posting by John Clement. For further information contact: Lieutenant Colonel Jim Cary, Director, Community Learning Network Working Group (703) 247-8328 or Mr. Jeff Joseph, VP for Domestic Policy, U.S. Chamber of Commerce (202) 463-5493.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

# Depository Library Council Questions Presented and Suggested Answers

## October 19-20 1992 • Washington, DC

### Restructuring the Federal Depository Library Program
### Question 1

Should there be a Depository Library Program in the electronic age?

If so, how could the program be structured to fit the realities of the current GPO budget? If we are going to talk about restructuring, the first question that needs to be asked is if there should be a program. That question is particularly relevant right now as technology is changing because it is raising that question in very fundamental ways. Do we really need a program with the change to electronic? The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has not said that there needs to be a program in the electronic age, whereas others have. We have heard the following thoughts expressed: Do we need libraries if there are no longer physical pieces? The program would cost too much money. GPO can't do it. Libraries have said they don't want it because they can't afford it.

Some of the issues raised have been: If we assume that the sun is setting on the FDLP, do we want a program in the future? What would be the goals of such a program? Ought there to be a program, and how would we design it? We can start with the assumption that there is a role for all the players, but we need to define what GPO's role would be.

Goals of a New Program

1. Comprehensiveness of access - assume all the information is available through the program.

2. Librarians as key intermediaries - to provide meaning and value to the information, as well as user training and user assistance.

3. Equity of access.

4. Tactile nature and browsability of books in libraries.

5. Library/librarians role in generational/transitional problem with electronics.

6. Broader vision - people come in looking for something specific and find out about other government information.

7. Electronic dissemination - opportunity for economic/agency/staff efficiency; possibility of print on demand.

8. Different levels of service in the program for different access to data. Is it possible that those who select electronic products would have to provide a higher level of service? Would some libraries cease to receive paper products? Define responsibilities and incentives for libraries in terms of their collection development.

9. During the period of transition, depository libraries provide connectivity to network services, federal services, and electronic services that the general public won't have. Local connectivity is not going to be there for some time to come.

10. Single point of access.

11. Correlate distribution of resources.

12. Electronic access can allow searching across different data files (i.e. WAIS).

13. Still a need for paper products in an electronic age.

Council members did not formally agree whether there should or should not be a program, but since we came up with goals for such a program, the underlying assumption is yes. If we are going to justify a program with a mixture of electronics, a point of presence is needed and the passive access issue needs to be dealt with.

The whole notion of depository was raised since some people think it is an outmoded word; it's not proactive. Members of Council could not come up with something to replace it. However, the question was asked if there shouldn't be a correlation between allocation of resources and their use. Is there a way to measure this so you can get the most bang for the buck? Does it make sense to distribute material if it is not going to be used? But on the other hand, it may make sense to have something that is very expensive even though it has limited use. Electronic products are not necessarily better than paper products and there is still a need for paper even in an electronic age.

Arguments Against the FDLP in the Electronic Age

1. Many agencies are not willing to consign to GPO the dissemination of their data.

2. No one will ever give libraries enough money to make the kind of system we would like a reality.

3. Should there be a program if individuals can connect directly to the information?

4. Some people feel there is no legal authority for such a program.

5. Some people feel GPO is unable or unwilling to carry out such a program effectively.

6. Libraries cannot afford the necessary hardware/software and therefore would be unwilling partners in such a program.

The group reached the conclusion that this program has continuing vitality and life even in the electronic age.

## Question 2

What are the goals and objectives of the Depository Library Program? Are these goals consistent with the member institutions? Are the depository libraries also meeting their responsibility to serve the public?

The three major goals of the program as stated in Title 44 were examined. The first is that depository libraries shall bc located in each state and congressional district in order to make government publications widely available. Do congressional districts provide the best framework for distributing information to the public? Is the physical location of a library important? As congressional districts change, is there a way to consolidate collections and/or share services and resources? The thrust of change in the program has to come from the bottom up. What changes are they willing to make at the local level? New technology creates elitism. How can access be equitable? If libraries limit access to faculty, staff and students, are these institutions fulfilling their obligations as depository libraries? As Congressional districts change, libraries are added to the system, but there is no mechanism for decreasing the number of depository libraries, or denying a designation.

We can't say how Title 44 of the *United States Code* is going to be changed, but this issue needs to be addressed. Tension

exists between getting political support for the program by putting depository libraries in congressional districts and the economic reality of scarce resources. This is an inherent conflict in the system. If you pull out the prop, that is, designating in congressional districts, then where do you build that constituency and that support? Should there be some rational limit as to how many depositories could co-exist in a physical space?

It is not likely that we will get legislation saying libraries have to give up their depository status. If downsizing is something we are aspiring to, do we want to look at libraries with low selection rates, and offer them an incentive to become a basic resource center? Such a center would get a certain core collection, in exchange for not having to do discard lists, detailed record keeping, etc. What does that do to level of service though? Should GPO be far more rigid in terms of public access? Or should we be getting away from politically focused designations, by reducing what designation means? Perhaps the library could get the designation, with all of the clout, the Senators or Representatives would get what they needed, but GPO wouldn't have the full costs because the library would be designated as something other than an ordinary depository library. Or if there is more than one library in a district, should sharing among those libraries be a requirement? Should there be different requirements for different types of libraries?

It is not clear that decreasing the number of depository libraries would aid the budget shortfall. But it is conceivable that a radical downsizing of the program might affect the budget shortfall. Constituents would be upset and complain to GPO and their congressmen. There may be a danger in making the budget shortfall invisible. There is a need to draw in members of the community who can affect the problem and get them to work on a solution. If you get the libraries to voluntarily scale down their selections, it will be accepted much more readily.

A second goal of the FDLP is to make U.S. government publications easily accessible to the general public and to insure their continued availability in the future. We are still not clear on what depository librarians really want to receive. Is there room for compromise or is it "all or nothing?" Do we want the libraries to archive this material or do we want them to serve as conduits to other mechanisms? Can libraries service what they receive now? If some of the technical processing standards for libraries were relaxed, would that allow libraries to offer more services? Can the acquisition policies be more flexible to serve changing needs of the clientele?

Is it possible to send the inspectors out to do training on the electronic products, instead of inspecting those libraries that are doing okay? Self-certification for those libraries doing well would free up inspectors for other duties. If there were some incentive or help to libraries in making the transition to electronic formats, it might make it easier all around. The government would gain economic efficiency and would have helped libraries in making the transition.

The question of equity was raised. Over 700 libraries select Congressional reports in microfiche. It costs GPO $100,000 to distribute them, compared to $450,000 for paper copies to just over 300 libraries. GPO is using a lot of resources to let a small number of libraries receive paper copies. If all libraries received microfiche copies, the cost would be $150,000. How do you judge if those 300 are using paper to a far greater advantage? ACSIS will give GPO costs associated with every item shipped. GPO will be able to say how much it cost them to service each library. GPO could give each library a list showing the costs associated with their selections, and ask them to reduce it by 10%. GPO wouldn't care what 10% was cut. We have to remember the basic premise of the law though - to serve the needs of the congressional district.

The third goal of the FDLP is that depository libraries shall make government publications available for the free use of the general public. Do we have agreement yet as to what that means? Do we agree on the definition of government publication and what Title 44 really says? GPO's General Counsel opinion says free means without cost; libraries can charge for photocopying, and duplicating fiche, but not for reading the information. Even though GPO's General Counsel has clearly defined government publications as including electronic data and Joint Committee on Printing (JCP) agrees, OMB might not.

Are the goals and objectives expressed in the mission statements and strategic plans of the individual depository libraries consistent among libraries, with GPO and with the depository library agreement? More research needs to be done to answer

this question.

Assumptions Concerning a Restructured Program

      1. Information world will be a combination of electronic and print for the foreseeable future (5-10 yrs).

      2. There will be a need for information professionals serving the public at the user end. The corollary is that electronic services will not replace the professional for the same period of time (5-10 yrs). There is still a need for intermediaries, although it may be a different type of intermediary.

      3. Technology will be there to support the program.

      4. User expectations will challenge and increase.

      5. Points of delivery will become more diverse - users coming to the library to negotiate questions may be just one point of access.

      6. Need to continue/further leverage our resources through cooperative ventures since there is not enough money to do what they would like to do to meet the needs.

      7. Connectivity to INTERNET/NREN will be available to all libraries. Network access will be increasingly available to individuals, businesses and other organizations.

      8. Federal/state/local investments in network development will be made over the next 5-10 years.

      9. Information policy issues: the uncertain, conflicting policy environment will probably continue; constraints of Title 44; changes to Title 44 are uncertain. (What you deliver)

      10. Telecommunications issues will also remain uncertain and will be resolved on a much wider scale. This larger issue won't be resolved by the Depository Library Program. (How you deliver)

      11. There is a need to restructure the FDLP.

      12. Some depository libraries will be partners in change; some will not.

      13. The Federal Depository Library Program has value.

## Question 3

What Federal agency dissemination needs are being met through the current Depository Library Program? How well are they being met? How could the current program provide better service? What Federal agency dissemination needs could be met through a restructure FDLP?

John Weiner has surveyed fourteen federal agencies. Some general themes came out: agencies are not particularly familiar with the depository library system, while some felt their needs were being met through the FDLP. Some take a positive, active approach to the FDLP; others felt that use of the FDLP covered their responsibility and they didn't have to do much more. Agencies also believed that the system provides free information access to a broad audience, some members of which have no other resource. Several felt the system provided long term availability, so agencies didn't have to stock the information because it is out there for the public to access. Some felt the system provides an important agency link to specialized communities, such

as education.

How well are their needs being met? This is uncertain since many agencies don't know if libraries selected their publications and if they actually received them. Some agencies crafted other dissemination techniques, for whatever reasons.

How could the current program provide better service? Agencies need more awareness about the program; public needs to be more aware of what is in the program; and more direct communication channels between libraries and agencies are needed.

What dissemination needs could be met through a restructured FDLP? A restructured FDLP could address the duplication between some agencies and the FDLP; and could provide agencies with a greater incentive to consider the FDLP in their planning efforts to modernize their information dissemination and access programs and identify the best delivery mechanisms for their users. Archiving of information and agency expectations still need more discussion and investigation.

## Question 4

What criteria call be developed to measure the effectiveness of the existing Depository Library Program and how can these criteria be applied to models such as the one presented by ARL? What are the implications of maintaining the status quo and making no changes to the current program?

There are many ways of looking at this question; one way is an objective input base. Who gets evaluated? Depositories, not GPO, users, or agencies? Success is determined by looking at some of the elements of evaluation - do you have what you are supposed to have, are you keeping it in a way people can get access to it, is it there or not - all of which are objective measures. If you want to begin an objective outcome analysis of all the areas of the program based on customer components, that would be a completely different analysis.

An objective analysis of the customers should be done incorporating the following questions: Who are they? What do they want? When do they want it? Where do they want it? Why do they want it? How are they going to get it and in what form? Are they satisfied with the service they get and the resources which are available to them? Who are other potential users? What are other potential uses?

Other methodologies could be used to obtain the information - subjective, objective, inputs, outcomes, customer or user opinion, and systemic and organizational analysis.

If you want to evaluate effectiveness, you probably want to evaluate GPO too, besides the public. Other possible points of presence such as kiosks and government offices may also be measured for effectiveness.

Other evaluation components might be strategic plans - do they exist and are they being implemented? Is the program cost-effective? What plans have been made for growth?

Certain implications are involved in maintaining the status quo. The force that drives everything first is money. Is a match between resources and mission even possible? Are people willing to give such resources to you? There may be lost opportunities to provide better service at lower cost. Technological advances are not well managed, because we have differing formats, differing capabilities in different libraries, and unevenness in quality of service in different libraries.

The rest of the discussion on the question centered around an evaluation of the users. We need to determine what data already exists (i.e. raw data from the Hernon-McClure study of users), explore various avenues to collect data (i.e. Federal Depository Conference, academic institutions, large public libraries, focus groups, GODORT), determine what data we want, how reliable we want it, how much money we are willing to spend, and develop a plan to do this. Council may be able to include 2-3

questions on two surveys that are currently being done of certain segments of the depository library community. We do have to be concerned about getting piecemeal data which might not be useful.

---

## Question 5

Various critics of the Depository Library System have proposed alterative models such as the creation of a national collection or a system of "super-regionals" or electronic depositories to help relieve some of the problems associated with the current system. What are the ideal characteristics of these alternative structures and what criteria can be used for their analysis?

Council reviewed the problems with the current system to know why they are even talking about restructuring. Not everything that should be in the system is currently available through the system, because of fugitive publications and information. Service levels vary from library to library. Many regionals are not capable of handling the materials they currently receive. Funding for all facets of the current program is currently experiencing cuts, threatened cuts, or stagnation. There is currently not enough consolidated statistical information available to show who uses depositories, how depositories are responding to user needs, and what kind of return on its investment the U.S. government is getting from funding the depository program in terms of the value of public information and access. Electronic products require staff training and new procedures to be disseminated and used effectively. They also cause extra expenses for GPO and the libraries, thus further taxing limited resources.

Most of the approaches that have been suggested in the past stress a "level of services approach" that formalizes what is already happening in different depository libraries in the system. Maybe by looking at some of these alternatives we could turn a weakness in the system into a strength by tying an individual library with that particular library's users, their particular needs, and the expertise that is available. It would also tie those smaller libraries into a system whereby they could have a very specific role in contacting another library with a higher level of expertise, access to products, and available service.

Some Ideal Characteristics of a Restructured System

> 1. Participation of "have-nots" in the system by having some items available locally, but more importantly, focus on their position as an access point to information and expertise available at another level in the system.

> 2. Use of limited funds to insure the biggest return on investment - some libraries would have access to more materials, training, etc., and therefore, more funds would be spent on those collections; but the information and expertise would be shared on a wide basis within the libraries' jurisdictions.

> 3. An integral factor in the system working well is close cooperation between information creators (agencies), information disseminators (GPO), and information access points (libraries) to insure that the mission of the depository program is kept in sight and that information/products are used to their full potential.

> 4. Adequate training and expertise must be planned and budgeted at some level within the system.

> 5. Access to all materials at some level within the system and a quick, efficient mechanism to get information or materials to other access points within the system must be provided. We need to know that if we call someone else in the system we will be able to get help.

Three Possible Alternative Structures

NATIONAL COLLECTION - It might help to get more fugitive documents into the system if only 2-3 copies were needed. It would help the regionals in that not everyone would have to keep everything sent. This would be a very labor intensive and expensive level of service, but it might free up some funding at other levels that could help maintain this structure.

SUPER-REGIONAL - This concept is based on a geographic distribution, dictated possibly by GPO. This mechanism could more fairly allocate the resources within a region. Each super regional library would provide service to approximately five contiguous states. The same level of service would be provided by the national collection but just to those states in the region. This assumes a lot of sharing between super-regionals. Institutions should demonstrate ahead of time both agreement and ability to serve in this function. This would prevent a library's being designated as a super-regional without having the ability to provide the services needed in this kind of system. A question was raised as to what incentive exists for a library to be a super-regional. There might be financial support to be a super-regional, as well as extra training. Super-regional responsibilities fall into 3 areas: dissemination (electronic/paper/microfiche products), archiving, and training. A super-regional would serve as the Internet/NREN node for the region. It might also serve as a place to store large amounts of data since we can't necessarily rely on the National Archives to do this. The concern was raised that the thrust of electronic dissemination is just the opposite of consolidation into super-regionals. Supporting access to information might not need to be done in a super-regional structure.

ELECTRONIC DEPOSITORIES - Under this plan libraries would be set up to take all electronic materials, and the libraries would develop the technical expertise to handle the materials. This too would be very labor intensive and costly, but benefits would be realized as these libraries develop the background and know-how to help other libraries.

Criteria for Analysis of New Structure

> 1. Does the structure meet the information needs of citizens of the U.S. and the dissemination needs of federal agencies?
>
> 2. Does the structure meet the requirements of the FDLP as set out in Title 44 and any new legislation that deals with this topic?
>
> 3. Does the structure provide equitable, no-fee access?
>
> 4. Does the structure impose additional costs on the end user?
>
> 5. How is the program funded? Is it cost-effective?
>
> 6. How fast can you get information from one of the alternative structures to a depository library or individual?
>
> 7. How well does the new system evolve from the established system? Can all current participating libraries remain a part of the system at some level if they so choose?
>
> 8. How is training and expertise built into the system? At what level? At what funding?
>
> 9. Is the system accessible to all user groups? Are we taking account of urban/rural, academic/business, different geographical regions, etc.
>
> 10. Are all pertinent documents/products accounted for at some place in the system?
>
> 11. Is there a mechanism for gathering information that provides statistical data on how the program is serving users, who is served, etc.
>
> 12. Is system compatible with GPO strategic planning activities?

FDLP could address the duplication between some agencies and the FDLP; and could provide agencies with a greater incentive to consider the FDLP in their planning efforts to modernize their information dissemination and access programs and identify the best delivery mechanisms for their users. Archiving of information and agency expectations still need more discussion and

investigation.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

# 1993

# Depository Library Council Recommendations and Responses

## May 17-18, 1993 • Washington, DC

### Recommendation 1

Council agrees with the Acting Public Printer that meetings of the DLC should alternate between Washington, D.C., and other cities around the country. However, it is the opinion of Council that there is value to holding the spring council meeting in Washington, D.C., in conjunction with the Federal Depository Conference and Library Legislative Day. Consequently, we recommend that the spring meeting remain in Washington, D.C., and that the fall meeting be on the road. Airport hub cities, since they are easier and less expensive to get to, should be given first consideration as locations for road meetings.

#### *Response*

We concur with this recommendation, and will rotate the fall meeting of the Depository Library Council (DLC) to different locations around the country, in order to improve access and participation. The Federal Depository Conference will be held in Washington, D.C., on April 20-22, 1994 (Wednesday through Friday), with the spring Council meeting beginning on the following Monday, April 25 and continuing through April 27.

### Recommendation 2

GPO should experiment with teleconferencing the next DLC meeting as a prototype for improving communications with depository librarians and other interested stakeholders unable to attend the meeting.

#### *Response*

We believe that resuming the rotation of the Council meetings to different locations outside of Washington, D.C., will improve communications, especially through informal, face-to-face interaction between various participants and attendees. Although we will not be teleconferencing the fall 1993 meeting, we are open to exploring this approach more fully with Council in the future.

### Recommendation 3

Future Council meetings should be extended to at least 2 1/2 days and should include an open forum discussion by observers on the specific DLC topic for that meeting. The open forum should be moderated by a member of Council.

#### *Response*

We concur with this recommendation and will continue to work with the Chair of Council to develop the meeting in this manner.

### Recommendation 4

Council strongly supports the appointment of more practicing documents librarians to the DLC than has been true in the recent past, but feels just as strongly that a balance must exist in the membership of Council between practicing librarians and other interested stakeholders.

*Response*

We concur with this recommendation and believe that this philosophy is reflected in the appointment of the new Council members, who will serve until September 1996.

## Recommendation 5

An Operations Committee of Council should be established. The first charge of this committee would be to work with the GODORT Depository Operations Work Group (and other operations groups that might exist) to determine the best way to establish a single access point that libraries could contact for assistance with operational issues affecting the DLP.

*Response*

We have been working with the GODORT Depository Operations Work Group and welcome the establishment of a DLC Operations Committee.

## Recommendation 6

Council strongly supports the short-term electronic goals of GPO (as articulated by the Superintendent of Documents....) with particular emphasis on the need for a real (and immediate) success in the online distribution of electronic information.

*Response*

We appreciate the support of the Council in our efforts to achieve a real and immediate success in the online distribution of electronic information. The GPO Access legislation (Public Law 103-40) was signed by the President on June 8, 1993. It requires GPO to make the *Congressional Record* and the *Federal Register* available online within 1 year of enactment. Work is proceeding to achieve this goal.

[This response is by necessity fluid. A status report will be given at the meeting.]

## Recommendation 7

At a minimum, GPO should move into the electronic arena as defined in the GPO Access bills (H.R. 1328, S. 564), whether or not these bills become law. Inherent in this recommendation is that GPO would connect to the Internet and take the initiative in developing an online access program regardless of the outcome of these bills.

*Response*

As stated above, Public Law 103-40 was enacted on June 8, 1993. Council should be assured that the requirements for the GPO System of Access include accessibility through the Internet.

## Recommendation 8

The type of software that was demonstrated before Council for the online *Congressional Record* is the kind of forward thinking, innovative software that we would like to see accompany all Congressionally produced electronic products. Council recommends that in instances where GPO has input into the level and quality of software that accompanies electronic products and services that this or similar level software be used.

*Response*

We appreciate the Council's enthusiastic response to the prototype of the online *Congressional Record*. The Graphic Systems Development Division (GSDD) at GPO has been working on the design specifications for an online system which would make available the *Congressional Record*, the *Federal Register*, and eventually other Government databases. The prototype which was demonstrated to the Council represents the quality of software that GPO intends to procure for the System of Access. The GPO Access software will be usable on CD-ROM, so it will be possible for GPO to generate CD-ROMs that have the same user interface as the online service. Once software for the System of Access is procured, GPO will offer that software for other electronic products and services produced through GPO.

## Recommendation 9

Council should work with the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) and with GPO to optimize results from the Coalition's Access to Public Information Program (APIP). In particular, Council is interested in ensuring that results from the Connectivity of Depository Libraries initiative that is part of APIP help provide the answers necessary to determine the feasibility of electronic depositories.

*Response*

We have been advised by the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) that there has been little substantive progress on the Connectivity of Depository Libraries initiative since the Spring 1993 Council meeting. CNI will keep GPO informed concerning any future developments.

## Recommendation 10

Council recommends a moratorium on the establishment of new depository libraries.

*Response*

The power to designate depository libraries is vested solely in members of Congress and in various specifically named territorial officials. Because the Public Printer has no authority to accept or reject these designations, unless the members or officials designate more libraries than 44 *U.S.C.* 1905 allows them to designate, the Public Printer can impose no moratorium.

## Recommendation 11

Minimum technical requirements for existing depository libraries should be developed. In addition, it is the opinion of Council that libraries should be given a reasonable amount of time to meet these requirements. Failure to comply with these requirements after a reasonable period of time has passed should be treated as non-compliance, and a major infraction of the rules for depository libraries.

*Response*

The Library Programs Service (LPS) developed minimal technical guidelines for depository libraries in response to an earlier Council request. These guidelines were originally published in the August 31, 1991, issue of *Administrative Notes*, and updated versions appeared in the November 15, 1992, and September 15, 1993, issues. We agree with the spirit of this recommendation, that depositories should obtain sufficient computer hardware to provide access to the electronic information dissemination products being made available through the depository program. However, we believe that, at this time, compliance with these guidelines should be voluntary rather than mandatory. Making technical requirements mandatory may

result in driving less prosperous libraries out of the program, resulting in underserved groups among the public.

## Recommendation 12

The depository library community should be surveyed (with all deliberate speed) regarding potential interest in the following two ideas for short-term restructuring of the Depository Library Program:

> A) Basic Service Centers - a library could select a core collection but have no opportunity for other selections or changes. This would reduce overhead and maintenance for the library and reduce distribution costs for GPO.

> B) Cooperative regionals or multi-state regionals where the terms and conditions of being a regional are different from the current structure. For example, Regionals might not have to select 100 percent or might not be required to retain all material forever

### *Response*

Council took the initiative and prepared this survey. LPS assisted Council by reviewing the survey and distributing it in a regular depository shipment. We look forward to the report on the survey results at the Council meeting.

## Recommendation 13

Council concurs with Mr. DiMario's reading of Congress that the bound *Serial Set* is a valuable resource tool for the depository community and should be available to all depositories wishing to select it. Council is willing to work with GPO to develop a less expensive method of producing this title.

### *Response*

Binding operations are underway for the *Serial Set* for the 102d Congress, First Session, covering Calendar Year 1991. These volumes will be distributed to those depositories which have selected the *Serial Set*. Current House and Senate Reports and Documents are being printed in sufficient quantity to support future bound *Serial Sets*. However, the *Serial Set* continues to be the single most expensive product in the Depository Library Program. Printing and binding the *Serial Set* consumes nearly 12 percent of the funds available for all depository materials. The content of the bound *Serial Set*. is distributed to depositories in either paper or microfiche format at the time of initial publication. We would welcome Council's advice on practical, cost-saving alternatives for producing this title.

## Recommendation 14

Council supports the recommendation made by the Dupont Circle Group that the focus of the inspection program be changed to place more emphasis on education and training. In addition, Council believes that inspectors should rotate within GPO as ombudsman to communicate with libraries on depository issues.

### *Response*

The Superintendent of Documents is required to make firsthand investigation of conditions in depository libraries to ensure that the libraries are able to meet their legal obligations to maintain and make freely accessible the information provided through the FDLP. In our program support role, we have incorporated elements of management consultation, education, and training into the legally-required depository inspection process. Program support, which extends the inspection program,

promotes effective functioning of the Federal depository library system as a whole and includes such efforts as the development of state plans, fostering cooperation among regional depositories and other network development activities. The Depository Services Staff is instrumental in most of LPS' continuing education and outreach efforts. However, if additional emphasis is to be placed on education and training, it will necessitate obtaining additional staff and funding resources.

Two stated goals of the Library Programs Service (LPS) have been: 1) to increase communication and improve LPS responsiveness to the needs of depository libraries, and 2) to clarify the roles of managers and supervisors in LPS. In order to move toward these goals, three Program Analyst positions have been created and filled. This action gives LPS increased capabilities to investigate and develop solutions for the complex issues and initiatives facing the Federal Depository Library Program, and to improve communications with the community.

The three new LPS analysts are Gil Baldwin, Michael Clark, and Jeff Axline. They bring a variety of backgrounds and experience to these new positions.

In particular, Mike Clark, who has been with LPS for 5 years, brings to his new position the unique perspective of a former depository library inspector and a former documents librarian. This experience enables Mike to represent the depository community's viewpoint and interests in the LPS decision-making process. Mike will act as an "ombudsman" for the Depository Library Program, communicating with depository libraries and library users and reviewing inquiries to identify problem areas. He will then work with LPS managers to develop and communicate solutions. Since so many concerns presently relate to acquisitions issues and inquiry processing, Mike's initial assignments will be in those areas.

Each of the three analysts can be assigned to a variety of different activities or projects, and together they form a rapid deployment force which can be concentrated where the need is greatest. This analytical team fills a long-standing need in the LPS organization, that of freeing up the line managers to concentrate on their operational roles.

## Recommendation 15

GPO should explore the feasibility of distributing hardware to depository libraries to use electronic products. While this would probably require a revision to Title 44, long-term cost-savings by a wholesale switch to electronic distribution rather than traditional paper format would give credibility to this alternative.

### *Response*

An opinion of the GPO General Counsel, issued on March 25, 1991, concerning "Cost Sharing' for the Dissemination of Government Information in Electronic Formats", concluded that:

> GPO is obligated to pay the costs of conveying that Government information to the depository libraries in an electronic format or in such other format(s) as may be produced and made available under the Program. This would include the payment of telecommunication costs for the transmission of on-line publications when published only in that format.

While the opinion does not discuss the issue of hardware, it observed [t]he Depository Library Program was not intended and has not operated to fill the totality of the depositories' needs for Government information. Accordingly the opinion concluded that the GPO's obligation to assist the depository libraries will be viewed in the context of available funds and program priorities, as determined by [GPO, the Joint Committee on Printing] and the Congressional Appropriations Committees.

Consistent with this previous opinion, having paid for transmitting the electronic Government information to a depository library, GPO is not obligated to provide terminals for users. However, if funds were available for this purpose, and if the

necessary Congressional authorization and appropriation authority were obtained, GPO could furnish terminals to the depository libraries.

We believe, though, that should GPO begin to furnish computer hardware or other equipment to depository libraries, this action would fundamentally alter the nature of the relationship between a depository library and the Government. Historically, libraries have accepted responsibility for investing in space, staff, and equipment at levels which are adequate to ensure public service in return for receiving Government information free of charge. In light of this, and current and past funding conditions, our inclination is to maintain the current policy, as stated in Chapter 6 of the "Instructions to Depository Libraries", that each depository must provide sufficient equipment for the public to read electronic depository materials, and be sufficiently equipped to ensure immediate access to depository holdings regardless of format. Should Council's advice be to pursue this issue, we will be open to further discussion.

## Recommendation 16

GPO should solicit letters from Ken Rogers (Department of Commerce) and Phyllis Christenson (GAO) regarding the value of the Federal Depository Conference to agencies, either as vendor demonstrators or presenters at the conference. Letters would go to the Federal Publishers Committee and other appropriate organizations for distribution to Federal agencies.

### *Response*

The next Federal Depository Conference will be held on April 20-22, 1994, in Washington, D.C. Based on input from the depository community and the evaluation comments of attendees at the 1993 Conference, a different approach is being taken to planning the next Conference. The 1994 Conference agenda is being developed by a group of depository librarians, and LPS is serving as the facilitator for the Conference plans developed by these volunteers. Given the changes in the Conference planning strategy, we did not solicit letters from Mr. Rogers and Ms. Christenson.

## Recommendation 17

Should a stakeholders conference on the restructuring of the Depository Library Program he held, it is the strong opinion of Council that GPO should be an active participant.

### *Response*

Three GPO personnel will attend the Conference on the Future of Government Information. We will also attend future stakeholders' conferences as observers and as resource persons.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

## Depository Library Council Recommendations and Responses

## November 1-3 1993 • Chicago, IL

### Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council believes in the great importance of the Depository Library Program to our democratic society. The Government Printing Office has provided public access to government information to the citizens of the United States for over 150 years and has provided a cost-effective and efficient means for the distribution of government publications. Council is concerned that any changes in the administration, operation or oversight of the Program be carefully studied and provisions made for public input before any changes are made. We support the Public Printer in his efforts to improve the Depository Library Program and advance it into the next century of the electronic age. We also encourage public debate about government information dissemination programs and the focus on the right of the public to access government information. We strongly believe that this debate and right must not be abridged by precipitous legislative action.

#### Response

The Government Printing Office (GPO) appreciates the support of the Depository Library Council (DLC) in maintaining the integrity of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). As the provider of this essential public service, we agree that thoughtful discussion and public debate on significant changes to the Program are appropriate and necessary in order to continue the provision of free and unrestricted public access to Federal government information. The GPO is also encouraged by Council's support for GPO initiatives in electronic information dissemination.

### Recommendation 2

Council accepts the Depository Library Council report on Alternatives for Restructuring the Depository Library Program <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/alternat.html> and recommends it to the Public Printer as a supporting document in the future study of the depository program. The report was well-researched and received significant public input. It has served as one of the main documents for focusing the discussion of restructuring issues and as such was instrumental to the work of the Chicago Conference on the Future of Government Information.

#### Response

The GPO appreciates the work of the DLC in preparing the report on Alternatives for Restructuring the Depository Library Program <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/alternat.html> and recognizes Council's acceptance of the report. GPO wishes to express its gratitude to the DLC for its thoughtful and studied contribution to improvement of the FDLP.

### Recommendation 3

Council endorses in principle the concept and the mission and goals statement of the Chicago Conference on the Future of Federal Government Information.

#### Response

The GPO also appreciates the time and effort the many depository librarians and others expended at the Chicago Conference and the report that resulted.

## Recommendation 4

The distribution of DOE microfiche, the USGS Orthophotoquad images on CD-ROMs, and the *Congressional Serial Set* all present special challenges to the existing regional structure of the Program. They also give us the opportunity to continue to explore different options and models for disseminating these kinds of products to depository libraries. Council will form an Ad Hoc Committee to work with GPO and the depository library community to develop a proposal for a prototype shared-regional system. The Ad Hoc Committee should involve Council members, regional librarians, selective librarians, GPO staff, and other interested stakeholders. A prototype will be developed by this group that can be used as the basis for discussion at the April 1994 Depository Library Conference and the Depository Library Council Meeting. The goal will be to leave these meetings with an overall endorsement of the prototype by these two groups.

### *Response*

The GPO recognizes the unique challenges facing regional depository libraries in the face of a proliferation of Federal information and the variety of media in which this information is available. We look forward to working with the Committee and receiving the results of the Committee's work.

## Recommendation 5

Council recommends regionals have the option of choosing a single format when dual format is offered for an item number. Council believes such a policy could represent a savings to the Program and provide some flexibility that regional librarians have requested.

### *Response*

The GPO believes this recommendation is a viable option under the authority of Section 1914, Title 44 and has considerable merit for a number of reasons. Not only would such a policy result in fiscal savings for the FDLP, but implementation of this policy would ease the strain many regional depositories bear in the processing and housing of duplicate material. We suggest that the DLC Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure incorporate this recommendation into its considerations.

## Recommendation 6

Council recognizes that all agencies have training responsibilities for the products and services they develop. Therefore, Council encourages GPO to take an active role in developing and implementing a training program for the products and services in the GPO Access System.

### *Response*

GPO has addressed the need for training by incorporating an online tutorial in the requirements for the online service component of the GPO Access System. GPO also intends, if possible, to provide an offline tutorial on CD-ROM or diskette. These tools will permit depository library staff and users to easily train themselves to use the online service and the related CD-ROM products.

The contract for development of the Prototype Locator also includes the development of training materials suitable for use by depository library staff and public access users.

## Recommendation 7

GPO staff members have asked Council for advice on several cataloging questions: cooperative cataloging with the Library of Congress, National Library of Medicine, and National Library of Agriculture; use of a single bibliographic record to describe both paper and microfiche copies of a publication; and use of non-standard (not LC) subject headings for specific technical and scientific documents. Council encourages GPO to pursue cooperative, cost-effective and efficient means of carrying out their cataloging activities. Council recommends continued consultation with the depository and cataloging communities to insure that potential changes are communicated and analyzed for their impact upon those communities. To continue this consultation, Council encourages GPO staff to attend the GODORT Cataloging Committee meeting at the Mid-Winter and Summer ALA meetings.

### *Response*

The Library Programs Service appreciates Council's encouragement to pursue its cataloging initiatives. During the 1994 ALA Mid-Winter meeting, the Chief, Cataloging Branch, presented a proposal to adapt NASA subject terms for NASA reports to the ALA GODORT Cataloging Committee. The Cataloging Committee will advise LPS of technical matters associated with this proposal and will be available for subsequent consultation on this and other matters.

During the Mid-Winter meeting, copies of the Cooperative Cataloging Questionnaire were distributed to Cataloging Committee members for their comments. In addition to presentations associated with the NASA proposal and the cataloging questionnaire, it was announced that the proposal to produce a single record for microfiche and hard copy editions of a title would be dropped. The potential problems that could be created by a single record for dual formats, particularly for those libraries which load MOCAT records, appear to exceed the potential advantages.

## Recommendation 8

Council recommends that the Public Printer invite executive agencies to work with GPO staff, JCP staff, staff of the congressional oversight committees, and depository librarians to form joint teams to examine agency publishing policies and practices. These teams would pull together the financial and program decision-makers, information producers, and information users in the hopes of improving information dissemination efforts. The teams would be involved in discussing issues such as identifying the value and content of the information in terms that could be used by depository librarians in the selection process, formats in which the products would be released, and software requirements for running electronic products. Council suggests the Public Printer choose an agency for this liaison team that has a CD-ROM product that is not currently in the depository program, thereby alerting them to dissemination of this product through depositories.

### *Response*

The GPO and Federal agencies are continually involved in activities aimed at examining and improving agency publishing policies and practices.

Formal channels include GPO's Institute for Federal Printing and Publishing which provides a venue for GPO to conduct training classes for representatives of publishing agencies. LPS staff regularly present information to the participants about the Federal Depository Library Program. The Advisory Council on Printing and Publishing Services involves representatives of publishing agencies working with GPO to improve printing and publishing quality. In addition, GPO works regularly with the Federal Publishers Committee and the Federal Communicators.

The staffs of GPO's Customer Service and Printing Procurement Department and the Superintendent of Document's Marketing Office, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Service, Sales Management Division, and Library Division all conduct outreach efforts working directly with executive agency publishing and printing personnel in the development

and dissemination of information products. A current example is GPO's work with the Department of Commerce to have the *NESE* and *NTDB* CD-ROMS produced through the GPO and to assure prompt distribution to the depository libraries.

The GPO hopes to play a stronger coordinating role in the future in terms of electronic information dissemination. The specific team approach proposed by Council will certainly be considered in this effort.

## Recommendation 9

Council commends GPO for the establishment of a committee to explore options for providing for greater selectivity in the depository item selection process. We encourage GPO staff to continue this study into the possibility of more specific item selection via the SuDocs stem and encourage them to continue to involve depository librarians in these discussions.

### *Response*

Our internal LPS task force has completed its study and developed recommendations concerning opportunities for more specific selections. We will report to Council on the results of this study at the April meeting. Assuming the study recommendations are accepted, a group of depository librarians, including George Barnum, Clare Beck, Cynthia Bower, and Jack McGeachy, has volunteered to assist LPS in the implementation.

## Recommendation 10

Council recommends that a report on the sales program be made at the user conference and requests that items warranting discussion before Council be moved to the Council agenda for discussion at the next Council meeting.

### *Response*

The Superintendent of Documents will incorporate remarks about matters affecting the GPO Sales Program in his remarks at the April, 1994 Depository Library Council meeting.

## Recommendation 11

Council commends GPO on the minimum technical standards published in *Administrative Notes* and recommends that these standards be followed by guidelines for advancement to be used by depositories who are currently at capacity with the minimum equipment.

### *Response*

LPS intends to continue providing updated guidelines as need is indicated. Depository libraries will be kept informed of changes, or augmentation of the technical specifications, required for the provision of proper depository service via the usual channels. LPS plans to survey the depository community this Spring about their electronic support resources. Once this survey is completed, we will decide on an approach to further guidelines/standards.

## Recommendation 12

Council recommends that the USGS Digital Orthophotoquads on CD-ROM be distributed along the following guidelines: regionals may select any or all of the DOQs; selectives may choose only one state but that may be any state they chose; within

a region, libraries having a cartographic specialty should be recruited to house a national collection and assume the regional's responsibility for providing access to the discs; the survey should make it clear that GIS software is required for effective use.

### Response

The survey of the *Digital Orthophotoquadrangle Maps* on CD-ROM (Survey Number 93-003) was conducted along the lines recommended by DLC. LPS' actions resulted in Program savings estimated at $3.8 million over the FY 1994 through FY 1998 period. Unrestricted selection of this extensive set could have cost the Federal Depository Library Program as much as $4,200,000 over the project's life cycle. A significant contribution towards realizing these savings was made by depository libraries in several states that made excellent efforts to develop resource-sharing initiatives, thus maximizing the effectiveness of the material while minimizing the expense to their libraries and the GPO.

## Recommendation 13

Council recommends that the Public Printer give input to the Information Infrastructure Task Force (IITF) regarding the National Information Infrastructure (NII) initiatives and that information regarding these activities be conveyed to Council. Council goes on record as expressing our concern that the Public Printer was not included in the Task Force membership and supporting appointment of someone from the depository library community to the Advisory Committee to the Task Force.

### Response

GPO appreciates, and shares, the concern of the DLC that the Public Printer was not assigned a position on the Information Infrastructure Task Force (IITF). However, the IITF is a body of the United States Advisory Council on the National Information Infrastructure (the IITF Council) as established by Executive Order 12864, dated September 13, 1993, which is established under the Office of the Secretary of Commerce, and is clearly an Executive Branch initiative. Executive Order 12864 authorizes the chairperson to "invite experts to submit information to the [IITF] Council and may from time to time form subcommittees of the [IITF] Council to review specific issues." The Dean of the School of Library and Information Science at the University of Pittsburgh, Dr. Toni Bearman, provides representation on the IITF Council for the professional library community. Dr. Bearman is a key speaker at the April Depository Library Council meeting. The Public Printer will, of course, provide any assistance necessary to the [IITF] Council to support its mission when such assistance is sought.

## Recommendation 14

Council recommends that GPO initiate a marketing program that would involve a plan for the depository library program as a whole and a marketing model that could be adapted for each depository library. Council feels it is critical to build an informed constituency that recognizes the value of the depository program. The marketing program should speak to this objective. Council encourages GPO to use the GPO Bulletin Board on Internet to market to computer users who might not have come in contact with the Program in the past.

### Response

For the past decade or longer the Marketing Office has provided marketing support to the Federal Depository Library Program. Our initiatives have included print and broadcast public service announcements and an array of promotional materials such as posters, signs, directories, and bumper stickers.

We now plan to take advantage of the technology advances that are changing the depository library environment -- CD-ROM, multi-media, bulletin boards, Internet, and the upcoming Prototype Locator System. We see an outstanding opportunity to develop and implement a marketing plan that both capitalizes on and promotes electronic media. This will supplement our

traditional promotional tools.

To develop a marketing plan that exploits and promotes electronic media -- one that can be adapted or customized locally to suit individual depository librarians -- we propose to survey depository librarians, library patrons, and key personnel in the Library Programs Service and other areas of GPO.

The information collected from this survey will help us design a marketing plan that increases awareness of the Federal Depository Library Program, takes advantage of current technology and the Prototype Locator System, and helps depository librarians promote their individual collections.

## Recommendation 15

Council recommends that GPO staff expedite as much as possible the project to capture cost data on individual items. This step is crucial to making informed choices when cuts have to be made.

### *Response*

Improved management of the resources provided for the FDLP is not only a goal, but an obligation, that is felt very strongly. In this regard, the Public Printer has assigned the Director, Policy Coordination staff, a senior GPO management official, to work with the LPS staff, GPO Production personnel, and other GPO offices to insure that LPS receives the financial information required to properly manage the FDLP.

However, the concept of managing the FDLP by making depositories choose among available products on the basis of cost is not an initiative that we intend to pursue. Although depository libraries are encouraged to consider the cost to the taxpayer of their collection development decisions, the libraries' primary consideration must be full and equitable public service. GPO will continue to submit to the Congress appropriations requests which reflect the totality of Program requirements. We will make the fullest use of our available funds to maintain and even expand the range of products and services delivered to the libraries.

## Recommendation 16

Council recommends that the Fall 1994 meeting be held in either the Pacific Northwest region (Ex: Seattle or Portland) or the middle of the country (Ex: St. Louis, New Orleans, Nashville).

### *Response*

The Fall, 1994 meeting of the DLC will be held in Portland, Oregon.

## Recommendation 17

The Depository Library Council recognizes the importance of the *U.S. Congressional Serial Set*. Historically, the *Serial Set* preserved and provided access to important Executive agency and Congressional publications, and it continues to preserve Congressional reports and documents for citizen access and scholarly research into public policy. It is the primary, unchanging, official legal record of legislative intent. Approximately 400 depository libraries currently select the bound edition of the *Serial Set*. The production and distribution of these 400 copies is the most costly component of the FDLP budget, comprising 12 percent of expenditures. Given the limitations of GPO's budget, Council's recommendations are offered in an attempt to balance the following principles and concerns:

1) that the information content of the *Serial Set* be widely available and historically preserved in an archival/permanent format;

2) that mechanisms are in place to insure comprehensiveness of collections for all libraries selecting Congressional publications;

3) that the *Serial Set* be produced in the most cost-effective manner possible;

4) that the FDLP operate within its budget and effectively carry out all of its responsibilities.

Libraries currently may select one or more of the following options for Congressional reports and documents:

1) receive individual reports and documents in paper;

2) receive individual reports and documents in microfiche;

3) receive the bound (paper) *Serial Set*.

The present distribution system results in some libraries receiving duplicate paper editions of the same information. While Council generally believes that all government information products should be available to all depository libraries in multiple, usable formats, Council also recognizes the serious limitations of GPO's budget and the disproportionate impact of the cost of the *Serial Set* on the budget. Given these constraints, Council believes the duplicate paper distribution of Congressional reports and documents is not warranted.

The following set of recommendations regarding the *Serial Set* is offered in response to the request from LPS for advice on this difficult issue. Council appreciates the steps taken by LPS to solicit input and advice from Council and the depository library community with respect to this issue.

- [17-A] Council recommends that GPO investigate methods to reduce the costliness of producing, collating, and binding the Serial Set, including the possibility of contracting out the hand-collating of Serial Set volumes.

- [17-B] Council recommends that GPO investigate the feasibility of on-demand printing of Congressional reports and documents using electronic print technologies, as well as electronic online access to Congressional reports and documents.

- [17-C] Council recommends that GPO investigate the option of distributing Congressional reports and documents to libraries on silver-halide microfiche rather than diazo.

- [17-D] Council recommends that a member of the Depository Library Council be named to the *Serial Set* Committee of the Joint Committee on Printing. Council encourages the Serial Set Committee to examine the possible revision of the *Serial Set* volume numbering process and other potential improvements.

- [17-E] Council recommends that any change to the policy for distributing the *Serial Set* be made only if shortages in the GPO budget make such a change a necessity, and if sufficient cost-savings in production, collating, and binding cannot be found.

- [17-F] If changes in distribution are necessary, then Council recommends that GPO implement the following two-step plan.

Step one should be implemented immediately. If GPO's budget situation requires further cost reductions beyond those outlined in Step 1, then Step 2 should be implemented.

- STEP 1: All regionals will receive a bound edition of the *Serial Set*. Selective depository libraries may select only one of the following options for receiving Congressional reports and documents:

a) In order to be eligible to receive a bound edition of the *Serial Set*, a selective depository must choose to receive the initial reports and documents in microfiche.

b) If a library selects the individual reports and documents in paper, they may not receive a bound *Serial Set*. Libraries are encouraged to permanently bind these publications, in essence producing their own copy of the *Serial Set*. Regional libraries should be encouraged to share paper copies of individual reports and documents with selectives to help replace missing reports for binding.

c) A library may choose to select only the individual reports and documents in microfiche (with guide cards for *Serial Set* volume numbers).

d) These changes should begin with the distribution of the *Serial Set* volumes for the 103rd Congress, since the reports for the 102nd Congress have already been printed. Further, changes of this magnitude require that libraries be given as much advance notice as possible.

This plan eliminates the duplicate distribution of publications in the same format (paper) as represented in the individual reports and the bound *Serial Set*.

- STEP 2: The recommendations outlined here (Step 2) should only be implemented after other cost-savings measures, including those mentioned in Step 1 above, have been implemented and if GPO's budget situation requires additional reductions.

    a) Bound editions of the *Congressional Serial Set* should be distributed only to regional depository libraries and to a designated library in each state without a regional, following the procedure used for the bound *Congressional Record*.

    b) Selective depository libraries may choose to receive Congressional reports and documents in either paper or microfiche. Libraries receiving paper copies should be encouraged to permanently bind these publications, in essence producing their own copy of the *Serial Set*.

    c) Regional libraries should be encouraged to share paper copies of individual reports and documents with selectives to help replace missing reports for binding.

    d) These changes should begin with the distribution of the *Serial Set* volumes for the 103rd Congress, since the reports for the 102nd Congress have already been printed. Further, changes of this magnitude require that libraries be given as much advance notice as possible.

## *Response*

The GPO wishes to express its gratitude to the DLC for suggesting alternatives for this set of recommendations. Regarding the specific recommendations set forth, action is as follows:

[Recommendation 17-A] The Public Printer will establish a Study Group to look into the costs and benefits of various changes to the way the Serial Set is currently produced. This group will consist of representatives from the Serial Set Committee and from areas within the GPO. The aim will be to have results of the study available by the Fall Council meeting.

[Recommendation 17-B] Although the feasibility exists to provide some Congressional products via on-demand printing, reports and documents do not fall into this category at the present time. The majority of reports and documents received by GPO contain illustrations, graphs, charts, etc., in camera ready form which GPO does not presently have the capability to convert to an electronic format.

[Recommendation 17-C] The Director, Printing Procurement has provided the following information regarding the recommendation to "investigate the option of distributing Congressional reports and documents to libraries on silver-halide microfiche rather than diazo". A review of current microfiche contracts indicates that the cost for distributing material in silver halide rather than diazo could raise the cost per fiche by roughly 5,000% to 10,000%. For instance, the cost of silver halide on the cheapest contract used by LPS is $4.88 per fiche with a cost of $.087 per fiche for diazo. The cost of silver halide on LPS's most expensive contract is $8.04 per fiche and a cost of $.083 per fiche for diazo.

In addition to the prohibitive cost, this topic was addressed in the "GPO TD Technical Report No. 18" published on August 4, 1978, entitled "Archival Stability of Microfiche -- A Technical Review". It was determined in this report that silver gelatins are not appropriate as user copies for the following reasons:

- The effect of fungus on silver gelatin, diazo and vesicular films has been studied....

- Fingerprints must be removed immediately; otherwise, the salts they contain will react with the silver, damaging the legibility of the film.

The National Archives and Records Service [sic] rigidly pre- scribes that master microfiche be used only for making duplicates. It is also pointed out in this document that life expectancy is replacing the term archival. Life expectancy of 100 years equates to a permanent preservation rating. Such a rating can only be achieved under stringently specified storage conditions provided the films are properly manufactured and processed. Referencing the cited document, the following conclusions apply:

- Diazo films will be usable for at least 100 years.

- * Diazo films are best suited to resist the wear and biological attack they would receive in a research or depository library setting.

- The diazo microfiche GPO furnishes depository libraries is adequate for their needs.

[Recommendation 17-D] The recommendation that a member of the DLC be appointed to the JCP's Serial Set Committee has been forwarded to the Chairman of the JCP.

[Recommendation 17-E] The Serial Set will continue to be distributed under the present policy unless budgetary restrictions necessitate a change.

[Recommendation 17-F] GPO appreciates Council's contingency plan and will consider these steps should the need arise.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

# 1994

# Depository Library Council Recommendations and Responses

## April 25-27, 1994 • Arlington, VA

### Policy Issues
### Recommendation 1: Ongoing Advisory Role of Council

Council commends the Public Printer for his open, communicative style. We appreciate very much the opportunity to open an informal dialogue to discuss respective views of the Depository Library Council's role in advising him, and the predominant issues that he sees as most affecting the Depository Library Program. That exchange of views makes it clear that the Depository Library Council must play a greater role in advancing awareness of the Program outside of the depository library community among Federal government officials, and among other organizations working to develop government information policy and the National Information Infrastructure. Council recognizes the importance of ensuring that testimony from individual depository users on the value of the Depository Library Program is brought to government officials and policy makers.

It is also clear that the Council must continue to develop ongoing contact with the Public Printer, the Superintendent of Documents, and the Director of the Library Programs Service so that issues and program developments can be handled efficiently and without delay between regular Council Meetings.

In addition, the Depository Library Council recognizes as part of its role that of liasion for the Public Printer to other groups and organizations whose activities impact upon the Depository Library Program. The chief function within that role is: 1) to enhance awareness of the importance of the Depository Library Program to the public among other government officials and groups concerned with the development of information policy; and 2) to act a a "quick response mechanism" to advise the Public Printer on the depository community perspective regarding questions arising from legislative proposals and regulatory changes.

In this spirit, the Council makes the following statements and recommendations:

I. Depository Library Community Concerns and Communications with other Groups.

The Council will prepare a one page document of Depository Library Program principles and concerns for transmission by the Public Printer to the National Information Infrastructure Advisory Committee (NIIAC), and to others as the Printer Printer deems appropriate.

The Council will acquire a list of the dates and places for the NIIAC public meetings that are to be held around the country in the coming year and recommends that the GPO publish this list in Administrative Notes. Council will also actively encourage depository librarians to attend these hearings for the purpose of presenting testimony directly from the library community and individual library users.

The Council will explore strategies to highlight the positive impact of the Depository Library Program through such means as user testimony, public hearings, user-produced videotapes and letters, etc.

In the past years, depository libraries have been included in several initiatives, namely NTIS, which have been developed outside the Depository Library Program and GPO. While these initiatives may be beneficial to the Program, any change without advance notice and/or consideration to the impact on the Program may cause concern and confusion. Better communication and cooperation needs to occur between the agencies and GPO. The NTIS Advisory Board has expressed an interest in working and cooperating with the Council in areas of mutual concern.

It is recommended that members of the Depository Library Council attend NTIS Advisory Board meetings and any other agency advisory board meetings in order to provide useful guidance and insight into the Depository Library Program. Conversely, it is recommended that members of the NTIS Advisory Board and other boards be invited as guests to Council meetings.

II. Communications between Council and the Government Printing Office

To be most effective in its advisory role, the Depository Library Council must be kept informed of GPO activities on a timely and ongoing basis. Therefore, Council recommends that:

A. GPO responses to Council recommendations be submitted to Council and published for the library community as action is taken and/or as responses are completed rather than reporting them just prior to the regular Council meetings;

B. GPO staff reports, normally presented orally at Council meeting, instead, be distributed to Council either electronically or in writing prior to the regular meetings so as to preserve meeting time and to allow Council members to better prepare before the meetings;

C. The staff of the Superintendent of Documents, the GPO General Counsel, and others as appropriate, maintain ongoing communications with Council on GPO activities impacting upon, or likely to impact upon the Depository Library Program in order to maintain the current awareness of the Council regarding GPO activities and have Council in a position to offer timely and knowledgeable advice.

III. Council as a "Quick Response" mechanism for the Public Priner

The Council stands ready to serve as an advisory team for the Public Printer on specific depository library community concerns whenever he must respond quickly to legislative proposals, interagency questions, or proposed changes to Federal regulations.

Council recommends that the Public Printer direct his staff to take advantage of electronic communications for direct contact with the library community and ongoing discussions with Council. Council further recommends that the Director of the Library Programs Service and the Chair of Council serve as liaisons and coordinators in a GPO/Council/Library Community fast response network.

### *Response*

As agreed with the Chair of Council, the issues in this recommendation will be adressed during the proceedings of the Fall meeting.

## Recommendation 2: Links between GPO Production and Distribution

The Depository Library Council recommends that to the maximum extent possible, the link between printing/procurement and dissemination be preserved in the functions of the Government Printing Office.

"The Government Information Dissemination and Printing Improvement Act of 1993: Analysis of Its Possible Impact on the Library of Congress with Regard to the Transfer of Specific Functions of the Superintendent of Documents" dated January 26, 1994, by the Library of Congress is a thorough review of the issues and implications involved in transferring the Superintendent of Documents from the Government Printing Office to the Library of Congress, as provided by the amended version of H.R. 3400 which passed the House on November 22, 1993. The intent of H.R. 3400 is to implement cost-savings recommended in the National Performance Review [NPR].

The report notes on p. 35 that "There would seem to be no cost savings simply from transferring SUDOCS to the Library of Congress- - a transfer within the legislative branch. Cost savings may come forth from the transfer because of technology enhancements, downsizing, reduction of supervision, etc. These same cost savings, however, could be realized with SUDOCS remaining in the Government Printing Office."

The Council concurs with the Library of Congress' identification of a key issue in the transfer when LC expresses its view that because of:

> ..the central managerial role of the GPO in the procurement of government printing, the utility of divesting the government publication dissemination function from the production function remains at issue (p. 12)

The Council concurs with the concern of GPO staff, as discussed in the report, that:

> The current problem of fugitive documents...would probably increase rapidly if printing were dispersed to executive agencies and if the Superintendent of Documents function were given to the Library. However, if Library Programs is transferred to the Library of Congress, while printing and procurement function remains centralized at GPO, it might be possible for staff to continue to be stationed at the GPO plant in order to classify for the Depository Library system those items that will be offered for selection. (p. 30)

Various iterations of the NPR implementing legislation, however, provide for the transfer of significant amounts of printing back to the executive agencies. Ceilings of from $1000 to $2500 for print orders that could be procured directly by agencies have been proposed, which would eliminate from up to 80 per cent of GPO's printing volume.

The Council believes there will be a direct relationship between the amount of government printing which is handled directly by agencies, and the amount of government information which does not receive bibliographic access, and is not distributed to depository libraries for preservation and access. It will be difficult, cumbersome and generally ineffective for the Government Printing Office to attempt to capture for the depository library program large amounts of materials which have been procured directly or produced in-house by agencies.

Although sections of the draft legislation provide for an enforcement role for the Superintendent of Documents, the Library of Congress report points out (p. 12) a number of valid concerns about the implementation of this role and potential conflicts with other branches of government. The report also notes:

> Separating printing/procurement from distribution would have a major impact on the DLP and IES [International Exchange System] programs. Even if government printing remains centralized, but at a higher dollar threshold, the difficulty of assuring that materials Congress intended for the Depository Library and IES programs are actually distributed seem likely to increase significantly under H.R. 3400 (p. 22).

### *Response*

GPO appreciates Council's support and recognition of the probable impact on the FDLP should the linkage between production and dissemination be weakened or severed. Although H.R. 3400 is no longer a threat, the underlying issues remain, as evidenced by President Clinton's statement upon signing H.R. 4454, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for 1995.

> In signing the bill [H.R. 4454] into law, I note that this Act, the purpose of which is to provide appropriations for the legislative branch, also contains provisions affecting the operations of the executive branch. As a matter of comity, legislative branch appropriations acts historically have not contained provisions affecting the executive branch, and the executive branch has not commented on provisions of these acts. Since this Act contains provisions that depart from that standard, it is appropriate to express my views on these provisions. These provisions concern the involvement of the Public Printer and the Government Printing Office in executive branch printing related to the production of

Government publications. Specifically, the Act includes amendments to existing law that expand the involvement of the Public Printer and the Government Printing Office in executive branch functions.

The Act raises serious constitutional concerns by requiring that executive branch agencies receive a certification from the Public Printer before procuring the production of certain Government documents outside of the Government Printing Office. In addition, the Act expands the types of materials that are to be produced by the Government Printing Office beyond that commonly recognized as "printing". In light of these concerns, I will interpret the amendments to the public printing provisions in a manner that minimizes the potential constitutional deficiences in the Act.

In this regard, the exclusive authority of the Government Printing Office over "the procurement of any printing related to the production of Government publications" will be restricted to procurement of documents intended primarily for distribution to and use by the general public. Additionally, in light of the substantial expansion of the role of the Government Printing Office would be occasioned by a broad reading of the term, "duplicating", that term will be read to encompass only the reproduction inherent in traditional printing processes, such as composition and presswork, and not reproduced by other means, such as laser printers or photocopying machines.

Since the above statement was released, the issue has been put on hold for a year with issuance of the following Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies from Alice M. Rivlin, Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, dated September 19, 1994.

SUBJECT: Procurement of Printing and Duplicating through the Government Printing Office

**Background**

Information technology is changing the way words and images are put on paper, blurring traditional notions of printing and duplicating. As a result, the framework of laws governing these aspects of government publishing has become outdated.

In his July 22, 1994, statment accompanying the Fiscal year 1995 Legislative Appropriations Act, the President expressed his eagerness and resolve to accomplish a comprehensive reform of Federal printing. The leadership of the Congressional committees of jurisdiction has agreed to work with the Administration to produce a legislative approach to solvng this problem next year. Accordingly, we have agreed to maintain the **status quo** regarding present printing and duplcating arrangements during Fiscal year 1995 to allow this initiative to go forward.

We have agreed that legislative reform of government printing must strive to achieve three goals. First, it should improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of government printing and duplicating by maximizing the use of private sector printing and duplicating capability through open competitive procedures. Second, it should limit the Government-owned printing and duplicating resources to only those necessary to maintain a minimum core capability. Finally, it should enhance public access to government information by improving the information dissemination practices of the Federal government. I am certain you share these goals. We look forward to consulting with you as this legislative program is formulated.

**Policy**

Accordingly, as a mtter of Administration policy, Executive departments and agencies are to carry out their printing and duplicating activities during Fiscal Year 1995 in accordance with the following:

- The procurement of printing and duplicating services from private sector sources shall continue to be the prefered

method of fulfilling printing and duplicating requirements.

- All procurement of printing and duplicating from private sector sources shall be through the Government Printing Office, except for individual printing and duplicating orders costing not more than $1000, if such orders are not of a continuing or repetitive nature and cannot be provided more economically through the Government Printing Office.

- Existing agency in-house printing and duplicating operations and agency cross-servicing arrangements (e.g., GSA's provision of duplicating services to other agencies in field locations) may continue to operate normally.

- Agency printing and high speed duplicating capacity shall not be expanded. This is not intended to affect the ordinary maintenance and replacement of existing equipment capacity.

- Existing agency plans to downsize internal printing and duplicating capacity shall continue to be carried out.

- Agencies should ensure that all government publications, as defined in 44 U.S.C. Part 19, are made available to the depository library program through the Superintendent of Documents.

I must emphasize that agency compliance with these policies, and cooperation with Congressional oversight, is essential to the ultimate success of a comprehensive legislative initiative to reform government printing.

Alice M. Rivlin,
Director, Office of Management and Budget

## Recommendation 3: NTIS Interagency Agreement

Council highly commends GPO and LPS for their innovative and ground-breaking efforts to establish an interagency agreement with NTIS to provide access to STEI resources to depository libraries. The underlying significance of the inclusion of this vast body of heretofore fugitive scientific and technical information into the depository program cannot be overemphasized, and Council strongly recommends that GPO move forward with these negotiations with all deliberate speed. It is further recommended that Council be apprised of developments as they occur, and that Council be involved with any new developments in the proposal as appropriate. If a successful arrangement is established, Council would encourage GPO to use this final plan as a model in working out future cooperative agreements with other agencies.

### Response

GPO presented a comprehensive and forward-looking draft interagency agreement to the Director of the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) on June 10. As of September 30, we have had no response from NTIS.

On September 29, in a letter from the Public Printer to the Under Secretary for Technology, Department of Commerce, the draft agreement was discussed and a copy was attached. The text of this *letter* is included in the response to Recommendation 4.

## Recommendation 4: NTIS Grant

Council is pleased to learn that the Director of NTIS has requested a one-time appropriation of $6 million to provide grant monies to depository libraries for hardware, software, and training to enhance the provision of electronic government information. Should this funding be appropriated, Council recommends that the Public Printer, LPS, and the Depository

Library Council work closely with NTIS on the project, to develop criteria to be used in the disbursement of this grant.

## *Response*

NTIS' request for $18 million in appropriated funds included the $6 million for grants to depository libraries and $12 million to expand the FEDWORLD system. In the appropriation act for the Department of Commerce for FY 1995, P.L. 103-317, Congress appropriated $8,000,000 to the National Technical Information Service for a revolving fund for the implementation of the American Technoogy Preeminence Act, instead of the $18,000,000 NTIS had requested for FY 1995. In House Report 103-78, the conferees added this language:

> The conferees have been made aware of concerns tht some of the programs proposed in the original budget request for this account were potentially duplicative of the responsibilities of the Government Printing Office (GPO). The conferees expect NTIS and the Department of Commerce to develop a proposal, to be coordinated with the Government Printing Office, describing the proposed uses of these funds and the delineation of responsibilities of both NTIS and GPO relative to he American Technology Preeminence Act. The conferees expect the Dpartment to submit this proposal to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by November 1, 1994, and expect that none of the funds provided under this heading will be expended until this proposal has been received and reviewed under the Committee's standard reprograming procedures...

The following letter dated September 14, 1994, concerning this appropriation was received from the Under Secretary for Technology, Department of Commerce.

Dear Mr. DiMario:

As you know, in connection with the $8,000,000 appropriation to the National technical Information Service (NTIS) for implementation of the American Technology Preeminence Act (ATPA), Conference report 103-78 includes a requirement that NTIS and the Department of Commerce develop a proposal decribing the propsed uses of these funds and delineating the responsibilities of both NTIS and the Government Printing Office (GPO) relative to the ATPA. The Conference Report also includes an expectation that our proposal will be coordinated with GPO.

It is our intention to complete a draft of our proposal by October 7. We will provide this draft to you for comment. It is our hope that you will be able to complete your review and provide us with your comments within 10 working days after you receive our draft. This would enable us to submit this proposal to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate well in advance of the November 1 deadline set forth in the Conference Report.

In the interim, it would be most helpful if you could provide me with a description of your responsibilities relative to the ATPA. All of the responsibilities of NTIS under the ATPA are contained in Sections 108 and 506 of that Act.

Sincerely,

Mary L. Good
Uner Secretary for Technology

On September 29, 1994, the following reply from the Public Printer was delivered to Under Secretary Good:

Dear Ms. Good:

This is in response to your letter of September 14, 1994 concerning the implementation of the American Technology Preeminence Act (ATPA) and Conference Report 103-78 requiring coordination with the Government Printing Office (GPO)

The Government Printing Office was brought into ATPA implementation through the final rules issued by the National Technical Information Service, Technology Administration, 15 *C.F.R.* Part 1180. We commented upon the proposed rules which had no reference to depository libraries or the responsibilities of Federal agencies under the Federal Depository Library Program which is administered by GPO's Superintendent of Documents. The final published rules, however, contained substantial changes relative to depository libraries with significant impact on our Program. Unfortunately, GPO had no opportunity to comment on the final rules.

Section 1902 of Title 44 of the U.S. Code provides

> Goverment Publications, except those determined by their issuing components to be required for oficial use only or for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value and publications classified for reasons of national security, shall be made available to depository libraries through the facilities of the Superintendent of Documents for public information.

Using NTIS, or any other alternative information dissemination channel does not relieve a Federal agency of its statutory obligation to make information available to depository libraries through the Superintendent of Documents as required by Title 44, *U.S. Code* and "OMB Circular A-130". Only when such information delivery is authorized by the Superintendent of Documents and conforms to the regulations and guidelines established for the Depository Library Program have the agencies fulfilled their statutory obligations.

Accordingly, all documents coming to NTIS pursuant to its rules as well as those documents made available to GPO, in whatever format, should be available to depository librries under the auspices of the Federal Depository Library Program. The recent MEMORANDUM FOR HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES from the Office of Management and Budget, Subject: Procurement of Printing and Duplicating through the Government Printing Office, dated September 19, 1994, reiterates this position stating that "Agencies should ensure that all government publications, as defined in 44 *U.S.C.* Part 19, are made available to the depository library program through the Superintendent of Documents."

The NTIS regulations require depository libraries to identify and then request documents from NTIS which have not been distributed through GPO. Although, on its face, this seems workable, this mechanism would operate completely outside the Federal Depository Library Program. This means that the depository libraries which receive items from NTIS in this matter would have no obligation either to keep and maintain them or provide public access--basic tenets under which the Government makes documents available free to depository libraries. Further, there would be no central record of what documents each library received which is essential in order to be able to direct the public to a nearby depository library where the documents can be found. Finally, to avail themselves of these materials, each of the 1,400 depository libraries has been burdened with the labor intensive tack of searching the NTIS file, rather than receiving materials automatically as is done under the depository program.

Recognizing these serious shortcomings, GPO prepared and transmitted to NTIS a draft interagency agreement outlining how effective cooperation between the two agencies would be achieved. Briefly described, distribution would be made by NTIS through arrangements with the Superintendent of Documents, and GPO would reimburse NTIS for the services it provides. The proposed agreement also addresses placing records in the GPO Locator Service and full text databases in the GPO Storage Facility, which are two key components of the Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993, Public Law 103-40, dated June 8, 1993.

This draft agreement was transmitted under my signature to the Director of NTIS on June 10, 1994. To date, no response has been received. I am enclosing a copy of this draft agreement for your information.

So, in view of the NTIS regulations implementing Sections 108 and 506 of the ATPA, and through our own charter under Title 44, *U.S.C.*, we have a very great stake in the implementation of the ATPA. I hope this is responsive to your needs.

We look forward to receiving the draft of your proposal and to a response to our draft interagency agreement. I believe that implementation of an interagency agreement, which we feel can benefit both your Department and the GPO, should be of major assistance in allaying the concerns of the Congress, Federal agencies, and depository libraries regarding duplicative responsibilities.

Sincerely

MICHAEL F. DiMARIO
Public Printer

By the Council meeting, GPO should have received and responded to the draft proposal referred to by Under Secretary Good. This correspondence will be shared with Council.

## Electronic Issues
## Recommendation 5: Implementating the GPO Electronic Information Access Enchancement Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-40)

A. Council commends GPO for their progress in implementing the GPO Electronic Information Access Enchancement Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-40). The work carried out during this past year toward establishing an electronic storage facility, developing a locator system, and electronically disseminating the *Congressional Record* and *Federal Register*, as required by the act, was done with no additional funds in GPO's budget for this purpose. The Public Printer and GPO staff are to be commended for the priority placed on these efforts and their ability to deliver an operational system which meets the requirements of the act.

B. The establishment of the GPO electronic storage facility and the electronic dissemination of government information (such as the *Congressional Record* and the *Federal Register*) via the GPO Access system positions the FDLP on the brink of its electronic future. While Council is enthusiastic about these developments, we believe that the long-term benefits of the FDLP and future (i.e. historical) access to government information must remain key components of the program.

Council recommends that, in conjunction with the status report on implementation of the GPO Access law to be prepared for Congress, GPO should outline the role, scope, and operations of the GPO storage facility as well as its relationship with other electronic storage sites and the National Archives. Question areas to be addresses should include:

- How is the Owensboro facility protected from or prepared to respond to natural and other disasters which could result in the loss of government information files?

- Are there back-up facilities, and what is the relationship between these facilities and the Owensboro site?

- What is the relationship betwen the National Archives and the Owensboro site?

- Will agencies keep back-up copies of files?

- What procedures/guidelines/requirements will be in place to govern the transfer of agency files to the GPO site?

- What internal security procedures will be in place to guard against alteration or degration of files?

- What policies/procedures will be in place to enable depository libraries to access files stored at the site or elsewhere?

Council recommends that GPO share these reports with Council and the depository community well in advance of the Fall 1994 Council meeting.

C. While Council understands the rationale behind GPO's decision to initially limit depository access to the GPO WAIS server to a single IP address per depository library, Council is concerned that such a limitation will make it difficult or impossible for

some libraries to offer GPO Access to their patrons. Some university network systems, for example, have dynamically assigned IP addresses whereby individual workstations are not permanently assigned unique IP addresses. Other libraries may find that having to assign specific services to individual workstations limits their flexibility and impedes access. Council encourages GPO to move as quickly as possible to expand access to GPO's electronic networks and services so that depository libraries may make these services widely available to their patrons.

## *Response*

GPO has established a project to expand free public use of the GPO Access services under the auspices of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). A Depository Access Expansion Team will manage a gradual expansion of the GPO Access system through depository libraries, in order to carefully assess cost, user support, and system capability issues, and their potential impact on the Program. Under the general direction of Mr. Jay Young, Director of the Library Programs Service (LPS), the Team incorporates staff from LPS, the Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services (OEIDS), and the Documents Technical Support Group, and is charged with expanding the availability of the GPO Access services in two ways.

We will work with approximately 10 depository libraries which will serve as model "gateways" to provide free off-site access for the general public to the GPO Access services through Internet and telephone. Each participating depository library "gateway" will be able to serve up to 10 simultaneous users through a public access network. Using these model libraries as "gateways" will expand the potential number of users of GPO Access, move the FDLP forward toward the electronic future, and enhance the role of depositories in making electronic Government information accessible to the public. Members of the public who have the necessary computer equipment will have 24-hour off-site use of GPO Access via campus or community public access networks on a no-fee basis.

The model libraries should plan for public access, including information on how the service will be handled technically and administratively, how local user support will be provided, geographic coverage, outreach to the intended audience, etcs. A model depository may allocate some of its depository subscriptions to other organizations, such as public computer networks ("freenets"), under the general terms and conditions which apply to selective housing sites.

In addition, all depository libraries will be eligible to register for additional no-fee subscriptions under the "basic" offer, up to a maximum of 10 subscriptions each for the *Federal Register* databases, the *Congressional Record* databases, and the Congressional Bills database. The library may also request a mixture of telnet user-IDs (SWAIS) and/or stand alone workstation IP addresses (WAIS).

Public Law 103-40, The Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enchancement Act of 1993 (GPO Access Act) established three services: the online system of access, an electronic locator, and an electronic storage facility. The Superintendent of Documents will report to the Council on the business plan which is now being developed for the storage facility. This plan will address the specific issues raised in the Council's recommendation. We will share this plan with Council upon its completion, which is expected by January.

Since funding for depository library use of GPO Access has been authorized in the amount of $1.5 million for FY 1995, we believe that we are in a strong financial position to proceed with the development of the storage facility. In the long run, the principal users of the storage facility will be the Depository Library Program, the general public, and other government agencies. Consequently, the chief funding sources are expected to be the depository appropriation, user charges to individuals designed to recover incremental costs, and reimbursements from agencies which elect to use the storage facility to accomplish their own public dissemination missions.

The mission of the FDLP is to make Federal Government information freely available to the general public, and the FDLP is the Superintendent of Documents' sole authorized channel for dissemination of information products and services free of charge to the recipient.

## Recommendation 6: Electronic Information Conversion

Recognizing the increase in the number of documents that are available on the Internet and otherwise in electronic form before appearing on paper, or are available in electronic form only, Council encourages the Government Printing Office to continue to look at folding electronic information into the depository program. Council recognizes that changes in statute may be required.

### Response

Our recent initiative to expand the role of the depository libraries as gateway providers of no-fee public access to the GPO Access services is a vital first step into moving toward the electronic-based depository library of the future. While the traditional formats will be a factor for the foreseeable future, their numbers are clearly declining. By using the resulting savings to extend additional GPO Access services to the depositories, and through them to the public, we are establishing a channel which other agencies may utilize to meet their public dissemination mandates.

We continue to find additional publications in electronic format for distribution to the depository libraries. Often this information is only available in this format and agencies rely on the libraries in the FDLP to help meet agency goals for dissemination of information, in such product as the General Land Office, Automated Records Project, Pre-1908 Homestead & Cash Entry Patents. (CD-ROM, Bureau of Land Management, Interior Department)

We are also in contact with the Fish and Wildlife Service to try to obtain digitized versions of the Wetlands Inventory, which are currently distributed to libraries in microfiche. At present, 13,000 maps from this inventory are available on the Internet, but the CD-ROM version is still in the planning stage. The total number of CD-ROMs has not yet been determined.

Material continues to be added to the Federal Bulletin Board, including the Merit Systems Protection Board merit raise appeals cases, regulations, and special studies. These generally supplement titles distributed through the FDLP.

As we continue to increase the number of titles available electronically, we must proceed with a review of the duplicative distribution of material under the program. This review will have a significant impact on the libraries as there are publications which are not as useful in an electronic format as they are in the paper format. These are generally high use reference resources such as the *CIA World Fact Book*, the *Congressional Directory*, the *Statistical Abstract*, and the *Statutes at Large*. All of the above titles are available through the depository program or may be obtained commercially. While electronic versions are useful to supplement the paper copies, these titles are not suitable for distribution only in an electronic format.

## Recommendation 7: *Monthly Catalog*

The Depository Library Council recommends that it establish a working group of Council members to study the issues involved in producing an electronic version of the *Monthly Catalog*. The working group, which may include other individuals who are not members of the Council, will solicit information from the user community on appropriate formats for the *Monthly Catalog* and desirable features/functions of an electronic version. The working group will provide a mechanism for the transmission of user suggestions and concerns to the Joint Committee on Printing and the Government Printing Office. Cindy Etkin, David Hoffman, and Linda Kennedy have agreed to form the working group.

### Response

We appreciate Council's interest in the publication of an electronic version of the *Monthly Catalog* and seek Council's advice with regard to this initiative and concomitant efforts to reduce production costs of the paper version. An electronic version, such as a CD-ROM product containing complete bibliographic records, would improve the utility of our records and, if produced in conjunction with a simplified paper version, could reduce overall Cataloging and Indexing Program costs.

In a September 1, 1994, opinion issued by GPO's General Counsel, we were advised that "the Superintendent of Documents may order the production and distribution of the *Monthly Catalog* in CD-ROM or other electronic formats." In response to our question concerning GPO's statutory obligation in Section 711 of Title 44 to print and distribute "two thousand copies of the catalog in pamphlet form," the opinion stated that, "While it is clear that some number must continue to be produced in pamphlet form, the Superintendent is given broad discretion in areas such as document style, content, and production run." The opinion went on to say that "Provided sufficient numbers of the catalog are printed and distributed in pamphlet form to satisfy program needs and the intent of Section 1711, the total number can be something less than the 2,000 copies authorized by the statute."

We welcome Council's advice with regard to the basic characteristics of a CD-ROM edition of the *Monthly Catalog*. This edition should contain complete, official, and authoritative records and should offer its users maximum utility at the least cost to the Government.

Concurrently, we seek Council's advice regarding an initiative to ultimately modify paper and microfiche into useful adjuncts to a CD-ROM edition. As finding aids, these editions need not contain complete descriptive data, subject data, nor all of the current indices. They can be inexpensive, easy to use pamphlets, suitable for extensive distribution to promote access to Government publications.

The advice of members of the ALA GODORT Cataloging Committee and other organizations with similiar interests will be welcomed.

## Operational Issues
## Recommendation 8: Training and Technical Support For GPO Information Products and Services

A. Council commends GPO for recognizing the important role GPO plays in training and technical support for GPO information products and services. Three new phone support personnel have been authorized to assist users of the GPO Access System, and an online tutorial is to be included as part of GPO Access. Council encourages GPO to fill the technical support positions as soon as is practical, to quickly and throughly train these new technicians, and to continue to place a high priority on training and technical support for GPO Access. Council recommends that, as GPO's field representatives, Inspectors should be trained in the use of the GPO Access System and the GPO Bulletin Board in order to maximize training opportunities for depository librarians. Council also encourages GPO to continue to develop training tools (including appropriate documentation, tutorials, help sheets, quick reference cards, etc) for information products and services for which GPO is the issuing agency.

In order to develop this positive image, GPO should take every opportunity (i.e. library conference, meetings, etc) to make users aware of its products and services and to provide documentation and training. It is important that librarians and other government information users view GPO as a customer-oriented electronic publisher.

B. Council recommends that GPO continue to evaluate the Inspection program and its role in improving depository library services to the public . Guidance and program support from GPO regarding the operation and services required by despositories is increasingly important as the FDLP and libraries make the transition to electronic depository services.

Council agrees that the success of the Federal Depository Library system depends on the close cooperation of selective depositories, regional libraries, and GPO. Council further agrees that the "philosophy" of inspections should provide for a "positive, supportive experience for depositories and for depository librarians." (*Federal Depository Library Manual*, p. 177)

Council recommends that, in order to gather information on how to improve the inspection process, GPO perform a post inspection follow-up with recently inspected libraries to discuss how the inspection visit was conducted, the value of the

inspection to the library and the FDLP, changes or improvements in library service which resulted from the inspection, possible changes or improvements to the inspection process itself, and an evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the inspection program. Council suggests that GPO use this information and other feedback from the depository community to continue to improve the inspection process and to assist libraries in meeting the operational and service requirements of the FDLP.

## *Response*

A. The Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Service (OEIDS) has established the GPO Access User Support Team. The Teams's role is to register users of the GPO Access services, and to assist users in resolving problems which arise in using databases and retrieval software. Staffing this Team has been acomplished partially through hiring and partially through reassignments of current Documents personnel. OEIDS is striving to fill all of its vacant positions with permanent employees, which will enhance the Team's ability to serve GPO Access users. In the near term, GPO will provide the requisite technical information to establish the connection between the depository library or local network and GPO.

GPO is also developing a list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) about GPO Access which, when publicized, should augment our limited capability to provide hands-on training, We will also be seeking depository librarians who have successfully used GPO Access in their institutions to act as mentors for librarians who are just getting started.

B. LPS' Depository Services Staff, which is responsible for conducting the depository library inspection program, will assume a role in consulting with libraries and facilitating use of the GPO Access services. These functions are a natural outgrowth of GPO's expanded role in producing and delivering information electronically. However, conducting detailed demonstrations or training in depository libraries is not envisioned as a function for the depository library inspectors. In conjunction with site visits, inspectors will encourage use of the GPO Access services, particularly in those libraries which have not registered for the services, and they will continue to act as facilitators, making general presentations to larger groups of librarians.

In terms of improving the overall inspection program, LPS is proposing to inaugurate a formal self-study process whereby depository librarians will more fully examine and document their depository operations in advance of an on-site inspection. Many of the items now discussed face-to-face during the inspection will be encompassed in the self-study, which should allow the inspector to rapidly confirm the libraries' self-study findings, and move on to other activities such as consultation.

The underlying rationale for the current inspection process is contained in the "Guidelines for the Depository Library System". The Guidelines, which were written by the Depository Library Council and adopted by GPO in 1977, predate many changes in the Program, e.g. microfiche, maps, GPO cataloging on OCLC, online catalogs, commercial tape loads, electronic information products, Internet, etc. GPO proposes that Council establish a working group to work with the LPS Depository Services Staff to revise and update the Guidelines. When completed, the revised Guidelines will serve as the basis for further review of the inspection process.

## Recommendation 9

Council commends LPS' Item Selection Study Group, Thomas A. Downing (group leader), Laurie B. Hall, Sheila McGarr, and Ric G. Davis for preparing such a comprehensive report on the problems and prospects for providing depository librarians greater selectivity in the item selection process. Council, having accepted this report, recommends that LPS move forward with the implementation of the report's recommendations, with the assistance of depository librarians.

## *Response*

We are pleased to report that we have begun implementing the recommendations of the Item Selection Report. We have developed a time line for this project, and anticipate completion in December 1996. Staff have been identified to do the review and make the changes in the on-line systems. We have begun refining the current SuDocs classes to improve specificity. Most

new class numbers are assigned a unique item number. When distribution is made to the libraries under a new item number, the libraries are notified via a notation on the shipping list advising them to deselect the item number if they do not wish to continue receiving the publication.

We have also begun the process of identifying item numbers where disparate titles are grouped under the same item number. We have had suggestions from members of the library community to aid us in the project and are incorporating these suggestions in our review. Because of a limited availability of item numbers for expansion, we are also working with the staff of GPO's Office of Information Resources Management to modify two on-line systems to allow us to re-use some of the older item numbers.

Depository libraries will be kept informed of the changes via the *Administrative Notes Technical Supplement*. We will also keep in contact with the members of the Publications Selections Work Group to advise them of the steps we've taken, and to seek their assistance in meeting the goals of this project.

In conjunction with this review, we have begun revising SOD 13, "Format of Publications Distributed to Depository Libraries" to encompass electronic formats (CD-ROMs, floppy diskettes, and the on-line WAIS and Federal Bulletin Board systems), in addition to the microfiche and paper formats. We are also in the process of developing a new survey mechanism utilizing the Teleform software. This system uses a computer and fax modem to compile information which can be uploaded to our on-line system. We hope to do the next survey of new materials using this method in this calendar year.

## Recommendation 10: Analytical Cataloging

A. Council recognizes the importance of providing analytical cataloging information for CD-ROM products. In addition to enhancing the number of access points, analytics are especially useful when the disks are no longer current or when disks are followed by disks with contents different than earlier editions.

Therefore, Council recommends that GPO investigate and continue to explore methods for providing analytical records for CD-ROMs. In addition, GPO should communicate this concern to those agencies which produce periodic CD-ROMs containing time-series information. The series included may vary with each issue and the time periods' coverage for regular series may change in a predictable or unpredictable fshion. One solution to this problem is that adequate bibliographic information concerning the content, scope, time span of data, etc., would accompany each disk.

Another is to include specific information on the CD-ROM as to what information is added or deleted from the CD-ROM. Given the heavy use and large content of the *NTDB* and *NESE*, the Department of Commerce might well be one the first agencies to receive such suggestions.

B. Recognizing the movement toward "just-in-time" delivery of government information which is available in electronic form, Council recommends that the Government Printing Office explore the provision of catalog information for on-line documents, so that depositories may acquire and load this information into their online public access catalogs and better inform their users about the availability of government information.

** For example, the files on the Federal Bulletin Board (FBB) could be individually cataloged, or a record could be created for the FBB with analytical entries for each file on the Federal Bulletin Board.

Those depositories--and other libraries--which do not load GPO tapes would similarly find useful such information if it were included in the CD-ROM versions of GPO catalog records.

Council makes these recommendations with the acknowledgement that these are attractive enhancements on a philosophical

level. We would like for them to be studied to determine the effects on GPO cataloging workload, productivity and backlogs. We would also like for the analytics for online resources to be viewed in the context of where this information would be most appropriately provided--in the *Monthly Catalog* or in the GPO finding guides on the The Federal Bulletin Board.

## *Response*

A. GPO's cataloging of CD-ROMs meets the applicable national standards for these materials. Council's suggestion that agencies which publish on CD-ROM include bibliographic information concerning their products' content on the discs will be raised with publishing agencies in the context of our developing outreach efforts. We are open to specific suggestions concerning our cataloging of CD-ROMs and will continue to review our cataloging of these materials to ensure that our use of the applicable standards meets the needs of the depository community.

LPS has already requested this type of content information for the *National Trade Data Bank CD-ROM* (NTDB) and the *National Economic, Social, and Environmental Data Bank CD-ROM* (NESE). One of the clauses in our March 1994, Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Department of Commerce's Office of Business Analysis (OBA) addresses this issue. In the MOU, the Office of Business Analysis agreed to "notify LPS' contact at the earliest practical date concerning changes in product specifications. Notification of changes includes, but is not limited to, retrieval software, frequency of publication, number of dics per issue, packaging, major additions or deletions of content, etc." In September, as we advised OBA of our depository distribution requirements for FY 1995, we once again raised the notification issue.

B. Cataloging of online (intangible) electronic files is an emerging challenge. Using established full level standards, we have begun to catalog the approximately 110 Federal Bulletin Board LIBs. We intend to catalog new libraries as they are added to the FBB.

LIBs, or Libraries, are the primary components of the Federal Bulletin Board. Each LIB is equivalent to a title of a publication. Each LIB contains files that are equivalent to chapters of books or issues of periodicals. To date, Federal Bulletin Board LIBs contain more that 6,000 files. Just as we do not propose to catalog cahapters in books, we do not propose to catalog files. Instead, we have begun to catalog LIBs as a viable and effective form of bibliographic control over Federal Bulletin Board titles.

Our records of LIBs will include notes that contain access and content related information of potential interest to FBB users.

In addition to cataloging, we intend to increase public awareness of the Federal Bulletin Board by publishing a preliminary page in each issue of MOCAT that will alert people to the availability of this resource. This page will include technical information and a basic summary of the scope of materials published via the bulletin board.

Additional information concerning Federal Bulletin Board LIBs will be published in *Administrative Notes*. GPO's Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services will provide these notices to supplement our cataloging of the LIBs.

In terms of cataloging online information, we have begun, and plan to continue, cataloging of online resources which reside on GPO platforms.

Federal publishing is rapidly becoming more decentralized. One consequence of this is that many information products, both printed and online, are not being directed to GPO. We intend to conduct outreach to gain greater knowledge of agency publishing activities.

However, even with improved awareness, there is still the major issue that, at present, traditional cataloging of online resources is not the prevailing method for identification of materials published via Internet and other networks. Typically, this function is now being accomplished through the use of gophers, WAIS servers, World Wide Web Mosaic presentations, GILS-compliant locators, or other Internet software.

One encouraging note is a recently announced venture involving OCLC and the U.S. Department of Education to create a searcheable database of USMARC format bibliographic records of Internet materials. This initiative may lead to a number of opportunities.

So, there is indeed a challenge here and a great deal of study is necessary before policies can be established on cataloging of online resources which are not resident on GPO platforms. We welcome the participation and advice of Council in this effort.

## Recommendation 11: Dual Formats

At its Fall 1994 meting, the Depository Library Council recommended that regionals have the option of choosing a single format when dual format is offered for an item number. GPO responded that the recommendation was a viable option and suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure incorporate this recommendation for its consideration. The option of choosing a single format is one that regionals have requested, and no negative response was received to our Fall recommendations. Rather than waiting for the final report of the Ad Hoc Committee, Council recommends that the option to choose a single format be implemented as soon as feasible.

### Response

The Depository Distribution and Information System (DDIS) has been enhanced to allow the regionals the option to choose a single format when dual formats are offered for an item number. We intend to develop a survey of dual format publications for distribution to the regional libraries.

## Recommendation 12: Depository Conference and Council Meetings

Council recognizes the value of the Federal Depository Conference as a means of providing an information and discussion forum as well as an educational and training function for government information specialists and interested stakeholders. Depository Librarians should continue to actively participate in the planning of the Conference. Council also understands the importance of its role as advisor to the Public Printer in such capacity as that Printer deems necessary, and should address the issues at hand by coordinating its own agenda.

Council recommends that the Federal Depository Conference and the Depository Library Council be consoldiated into a single week with sufficient coordination among planning members so as to avoid unnecessary duplication and/or significant conflict of interest. Providing a more concise time frame for the two meeings would benefit all participants.

### Response

As announced in *Administrative Notes*, v. 15, #9, July 15, 1994, "[T]he spring meeting of the Depository Library Council will be held in conjunction with the 1995 Federal Depository Conference during the week of April 10-14, 1995. The annual meeting of Regional libraries will also be held that week."

Both that article and a separate announcement which appeared on the listservs GOVDOC-L, MAPS-L, and LAW-LIB on August 4, sought volunteers from the depository community to suggest topics and speakers for the 1995 Conference. For those libraries without access to the Internet, the latter announcement appeared in the September 15 issue of *Administrative Notes*. The LPS Depository Services Staff will serve as planning coordinators for the three segments of Conference week.

## Recommendation 13: Citation Manuals

The Council recommends that its Operation Committee compile a brief list of available citation manuals for government information in electronic formats, to be published in *Administrative Notes*.

### *Response*

GPO will be pleased to publish this list in *Administrative Notes*, as well as electronically, when it is available.

## Action Items for the Depository Library Council from the 1994 Spring Meeting

### *Operations Committee Charge*

The Council Operations Committee shall monitor the ongoing operations of the depository library program and identify issues which may require further discussion and/or communication with GPO. An action item for the committee will be to compile a bibliography of citations manuals for electronic information which could be published in Administrative Notes.

Members of the Committee are Linda Kennedy and Cynthia Etkin.

We recommend to that Printer Public that Mike Clark, GPO Ombudsman, be designated the liaison to the Council Operations Committee.

### *Information Exchange Committee Charge*

1. The Information Exchange Committee shall prepare a new member handbook.

2. The Committee shall review communication methods between Council and the depository community; the structure of meetings, notices of and information about Council activities, opportunities for interactions, etc. The Committee will determine if current communication is effective in keeping Council members and the depository community informed and if the community is given an effective opportunity to express views and concerns and is getting appropriate feedback. The Committee will reports back to the full Council with their findings and recommendations for any changes.

3. The Committee will suggest improved methods for getting pertinent information to administrators of depository libraries. The Committee will serve as the liaison for administrators.

4. The Committee will come up with a statement of purpose for the user testimonial project. They will provide a suggested format and suggest guidelines or restrictions that might apply to this activity. The information will be forwarded to members of Council and the depository community for use in gathering user testimonials.

5. The Committee is responsible for finding a vehicle for Council e-mail communication.

6. It has been suggested to Council that a continuing problem exists in availability of core titles when claimed by depositories. To analyze this situation and determine the severity of the problem, the Operations Committee will gather specific examples of this occurence, consult with the GPO staff, and report back to the depository community and the Public Printer at the fall 1994 meeting.

### *Compilation of Council Recommendations*

A compilation ofprevious Council recommendations would be helpful to Council, GPO staff and the depository library commununity. This compilation would provide background for future Council deliberations as well as assist in identifying

trends and problems in various groups. John and Vicki Phillips have volunteered to provide Council with a diskette of this information. Council will insure that this informaion is collected. If the Phillips are unable to complete their compilation, another means should be found. Council will find an FTP site or Bulletin Board site where this information will be placed for review and retrieval by Council, the GPO staff, the depository library community and interested stakeholders.

### Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure

The Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Structure will continue study on alternatives to the current structure and changes in the regional structure necessary to improve efficiency, economy, and the effectiveness of the depository program. The Committee should be prepared to present their ideas and recommendations for changes at the fall 1994 meeting.

## Commendations to the Government Printing Office From the Depository Library Council

### GPO Access to the Internet and Gocdoc-L

Council commends GPO on their entry into the electronic mail arena through their recent Internet connection. On-going GPO staff monitoring of Govdoc-L and their timely replies to queries have greatly enhanced the service they provide and the ability of depository library staffs to deal with problems andd new situations.

### Information Provided Through Legislative Update and Speakers

The Public Printer is commended for bringing the Council up to date on the various legislative and "reinventing government" initiatives currently pending. This information is essential to Council deliberations and we appreciate these efforts. It is also important for Council to be familiar with and understand broader government information policy initiatives. It is invaluable to hear from speakers such as Dr. Toni Carbo Bearman and to give them an opportunity to hear our concerns. The Public Printer and the GPO staff are to be commended for bringing Dr. Bearman to the Council meeting and Council strongly encourages future invitations to speakers involved in information policy initatives and projects affecting the program.

### Cooperative Cataloging Efforts

Council commends Tad Downing for his overview of the Cooperative Cataloging questionnaire project. As stated in a previous recommendation, Council is very pleased with the project and encourages continued work in this area. Council suggests that they be kept apprised of developments in this area and that a report be given on developments at the Fall 1994 meeting.

### GPO Cataloging Staff

Council commends the GPO cataloging staff on their many initiatives in improving methods and processes to make GPO cataloging more efficient and cooperative in nature.

## DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

## OCTOBER 24-26, 1994 • PORTLAND, OR

### Recommendation 1: *Monthly Catalog*

Council recommends that GPO proceed to develop a CD-ROM version of the *Monthly Catalog*. This is viewed as an eventual replacement for the microfiche edition.

Council has received the report "Data Elements to be Included in Future Issues of the Printed MoCat Catalog". Council requests that this document be promptly disseminated for comment to depository libraries and appropriate library associations. Further, Council recommends that subscribers of the *Monthly Catalog* through the GPO Sales Program be sent letters indicating that a format change is forthcoming and offer them an opportunity to provide input on the changes. Although Council's *Monthly Catalog* Working Group has already received comments on MoCat format and data element issues, it has not yet had an opportunity to review the new document. Council requests that comments received on this document be forwarded to members of the Monthly Catalog Working Group, which will respond prior to or at the Spring Depository Library Council meeting.

### *Response*

We appreciate Council's interest in a CD-ROM edition of the *Monthly Catalog* and in modifying the paper edition of the Monthly Catalog. Acting on Council's recommendation, we are developing a prototype CD-ROM edition of the *Monthly Catalog*.

Steve Uthoff's article, "Proposals Unveiled to Reduce Size of the Printed *Monthly Catalog*" was published in the December 15, 1994 edition (Vol. 15, no. 16) of *Administrative Notes*.

### Recommendation 2: GPO Access Database Enhancements

Although Council recognizes the advantage of immediately inserting page numbers in the electronic version of the F*ederal Register*, the confusion to users which is likely to ensue would outweigh the advantages. Therefore, Council recommends delaying the insertion of page numbers in the *Federal Register* until January 1995.

Council recommends that a mechanism be developed to indicate additions and deletions in the Congressional bills database of GPO Access. This mechanism should allow the added/deleted language to be conveniently searched.

### *Response*

The page numbers for the *Federal Register* and *Congressional Record* were added to the GPO Access databases effective with the first issue of 1995 as recommended by the Council.

A new scheme is being used for tagging inserted and deleted text in the ASCII text version of the GPO Access database of Congressional Bills for the 104th Congress. Inserted text, which appears in print in italic type, is preceded by a tag <INSERTED> and followed by a tag </INSERTED> . Similarly, deleted text, which appears in print as cancelled type, is preceded by a tag <DELETED> and followed by a tag </DELETED>. If multiple paragraphs of text are inserted or deleted, the appropriate tag appears at the beginning and end of each paragraph. Otherwise, the tags appear before and after the inserted or deleted word or phrase. This new tagging scheme makes both inserted land deleted text readily identifiable by a user and fully searchable as recommended by the Council. The Adobe Acrobat Portable Document Format (PDF) files are

available for all published versions of bills in order to provide users with the ability to view and print typeset copies. The PDF files represent inserted and deleted text exactly as it is represented in the printed versions of the bills. It is not possible to retroactively insert page numbers of the 1993 Record and register databases, or to create retrospective PDF files.

## Recommendation 3: NASA Thesaurus Terms

Council recommends that GPO move forward with its "Proposal to Use NASA Thesaurus Terms from the Online NASA/RECON Records on GPO *Monthly Catalog* Records.

### *Response*

We appreciate Council's support of this initiative. We have trained catalogers as necessary, and implemented these new procedures in February, 1995.

## Recommendation 4: Item Selection Surveys

Council welcomes the return to the use of formal item surveys for new item selections and the resumption of distribution of item number cards. Council trusts that the implementation of the teleform fax system for item surveys will reduce the time required for item surveys. Council urges that the interim practice of adding new titles to existing item numbers be used only when absolutely necessary for time sensitive and/or unanticipated items.

### *Response*

Library Program Service (LPS) resumed distribution of item selection surveys for new publications with the distribution of Item Survey 94-001 in December, 1994. More than 800 libraries faxed their responses to LPS by January 27, 1994, in order to add the new publications listed on the survey. This information has been uploaded into the Depository Distribution Information System (DDIS) to amend the library's item selection profile. Also distributed with the survey was a clip-art style item number card. DAB staff has reviewed the libraries response to the survey done under the Teleform program. These new processes should allow LPS to resume distributing new item surveys to the libraries on a regular basis.

## Recommendation 5: *Serial Set*

Council recommends that the *Report of the Serial Set* Study Group be distributed as widely as possible, but at least to those libraries that select the Serial Set in either paper or microfiche format. Council further recommends that the report be posted on the Federal Bulletin Board with as many appendices as is practical.

Although Council awaits depository comments on this Report, Council recommends that several of the near term action items be implemented as soon as possible so that immediate cost savings may be realized. The following near term action items recommended for adoption are consistent with previous Council recommendations:

- Shift from manual binding to machine (book-flow) binding for the bound *Serial Set*

- Investigation of commercial procurement of *Serial Set* binding services

- Undertake an operations analysis of the *Serial Set* collating process in GPO Binding Division

Regardless of the final decision with regard to suitable formats for depository distribution, it seems appropriate to begin

the process of developing electronic versions of the *Serial Set*. Council concurs with near term action item E which urges congressional publishers to provide digital copy for every Report and Document they submit to GPO for printing, starting with the 104th Congress. It is already planned that GPO will provide access to House and Senate Reports and is working toward adding documents under the GPO Access Service.

Further, Council recommends that GPO develop a prototype *Serial Set* CD-ROM. Council urges GPO/JCP to request input from the depository library community on the selection and development of software for the Serial Set CD-ROM.

### Response

*The Report of the Serial Set Study Group* was distributed to all libraries in March, 1995. The Public Printer has assigned responsibility for implementing the near-term action items to the Congressional Printing Management Division. Members of the Serial Group will continue to be a resource in developing plans to carry out the recommendations.

Development of a prototype *Serial Set* CD-ROM will proceed as the Congressional publishers are able to provide digital copy for the Reports and Documents. It is anticipated that at a minimum the House and Senate Reports will be included on the initial product. We will keep Council informed of further developments as this project proceeds.

## Recommendation 6: Self-Study In The Inspection Process

Council recommends that GPO's proposal to use a self-study questionnaire in the inspection process be implemented. The draft self-study questionnaire should be published in *Administrative Notes* and comments on the form should be solicited.

### Response

The draft self-study questionnaire for the inspection process was published in *Administrative Notes*, vol. 15, #15, November 25, 1994, pp. 22-37 and posted on the GOVDOC-L listserv. Comments from the depository community were solicited through December 31, 1994. Depository Services staff reviewed and incorporated comments and will issue a second draft of the self-study in Spring 1995.

## Recommendation 7: Training

Council commends GPO for taking opportunities to provide training on GPO Access to groups of librarians and other users, both in Washington, DC and in the field. Council urges the GPO staff to continue these initiatives and to explore other opportunities to assist librarians to gain proficiency in the use of GPO's electronic products.

### Response

Numerous training sessions have been held, with the most recent in Washington, D.C. on March 14, Chicago on April 3 and 4, and Dallas on April 5. Additional personnel are being trained to conduct training sessions and it appears that there is no shortage of opportunities.

## Recommendation 8: Documentation and Support for Electronic Products

In order to ensure that government information produced by GPO in electronic formats is accessible to users, Council recommends that GPO provide appropriate support and documentation for its products. The documentation should fully describe the product or service and include contents and instructions for finding, downloading, or printing the information.

Depository librarians should be informed of technical and software updates. Examples of support for electronic products could include tutorials, help screens, quick reference guides, and help desks. Furthermore, GPO should encourage other issuing agencies to provide a high level of user support for their electronic products disseminated through the Federal Depository Library Program.

## *Response*

GPO concurs with this recommendation, and agrees that electronic products should be easy to use and operate for the end-users. All online services operated by GPO, including the Federal Bulletin Board and GPO Access services, currently have User Manuals available. GPO has customized, to the extent possible, help screens and other aspects of the client software for these online services. The GPO Access User Support Team is available from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays (except Federal holidays) to assist users. In addition, the plans for the GPO Access Phase II online service includes a tutorial. GPO places a high priority on creating electronic products that are easy to use. We will continue to improve and expand the documentation and user support for our own products to the extent that our resources permit.

While GPO cannot require other agencies to provide the same level of documentation and support for their own electronic products that are distributed to Federal depository libraries, we do actively encourage agencies to do so. EIDS staff participate in classes to train agency personnel in the development of CD-ROM products and in many individual meetings with agency personnel who are developing electronic products. We emphasize the importance of software selection, good documentation and user support.

Many of the products that GPO currently distributes in CD-ROM already provide very detailed information on system requirements, program installation, and operating procedures. Most include printed manuals and/or README files on the CD-ROM. Some of the publishing agencies offer user support, and EIDS maintains a list of those user support contacts for all sales titles. We do not have access to comparable information for other CD-ROM titles, beyond what is submitted to us for publication in the SIGCAT CD-ROM compendium.

There is considerable variation in the retrieval software used on CD-ROM titles published by Federal agencies. Some of the software products selected by agencies are more intuitive or self-instructing than others. Often agencies select software for products that is primarily for internal use or for a specific constituency, and depository requirements are secondary. However, EIDS encourages agencies to understand that selecting software appropriate for Depository and general public use benefits all of their users. In addition, the GPO Access Phase II software procurement calls for a common user interface for online and CD-ROM services. We believe that this will be appealing to many agencies and that it will encourage them to use the new retrieval software for their CD-ROM titles, even if their information is not online through GPO.

GPO will continue to work internally and along with other agencies to improve accessibility and utility of electronic products that are disseminated to the public through the Federal Depository Library Program.

## Recommendation 9: Communication with Administrators

Council urges that GPO communicate its vision of the capabilities of and technological requirements for providing government information in electronic formats, to key groups of library and institution administrators (e.g., COSLA, ARL directors, information systems managers, etc.) as well as individual administrators who determine operating budgets or allocation of grant funds, or are responsible for requesting library or agency budgets.

## *Response*

Based on our discussion, at the Fall 1994, Council meeting, we have made several efforts to reach out to library directors and administrators. A letter from the Superintendent of Documents, dated January 4, 1995, was sent to every director of a

depository library. This letter articulated GPO's vision of the impact of electronic information on depository libraries, and encouraged directors to ensure that their depositories were adequately staffed and equipped to meet the challenge.

This letter also invited the directors to attend a special presentation on the "Federal Depository Library Program and its Electronic Future", which was held at the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia. This presentation, which was held in cooperation with ALA GODORT, attracted over 150 attendees.

LPS also updated and reissued the "Recommended Minimum Technical Guidelines for Depository Libraries", in the January 15, 1995 issue of *Administrative Notes*. The revised "guidelines" emphasized Internet readiness, and will support use of the emerging National Information Infrastructure.

We will also be speaking at the next meeting of the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, (COSLA) on April 9, 1995.

These and other high-level contacts have been used to broadcast GPO's vision of the electronic future, and have resulted in numerous expressions of interest from library administrators, particularly about the Model Gateway Libraries program.

## Recommendation 10: Gateway Services

Council commends the GPO for its timely support of gateways to GPO Access and for cooperating with existing state and local agencies or networks to develop the gateways. Council also encourages the development of additional gateways to meet the needs of the user community. Council further commends the GPO for increasing from one to ten the number of free subscriptions to GPO Access allowed each depository library.

### *Response*

In October, 1994 GPO announced the expanded availability of the GPO Access online services for depository libraries, including the Model Gateway Libraries program. Depositories may now offer the use of the GPO Access online system to the public at differing levels of service. In brief, these may be characterized as:

- On-site service for users on workstations within the library. The basics of the GPO Access online services and the expansion effort were expressed in the October 17, 1994 letter from the Superintendent of Documents. This letter described the general requirements for no-fee use of GPO Access.

- Extended on-site service for users on networked workstations on the campus. Typically, this level of service is exemplified by registering a server supporting networked users within the campus community. We now have 445 libraries providing on-site use of GPO Access.

- Gateway services, for off-site public users with remote workstations, which are connected to the depository gateway via modem or Internet. The Model Gateway Library program makes the GPO Access online system available to off-site users. In this context, off-site is defined as beyond your campus or institutional boundaries, not simply from outside the library's walls. A gateway allows remote users not permanently linked to the library's server to 24-hour access to the GPO server.

As of March 14, 1995, we had 8 gateways operating and some half-dozen more in the development or testing phase. GPO's near-term goal is to have at least one gateway up in each state by the end of FY 1995. So far, we have had expressions of gateway interest from 44 states, DC, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. In the long run, we want to minimize the distance penalty for rural users, and work with state networks and other partners to increase the area of coverage in which a user can reach a gateway with a local phone call.

## Recommendation 11: Council Membership

Council commends the Public Printer for appointing new Council members prior to the Spring meeting which facilitated orientation for new members.

Council recommends that future appointments continue to reflect the diversity of libraries in the Federal Depository Library Program, government information providers, and interested constituents which will enable Council to be informed on a variety of issues and opinions affecting Federal information.

### *Response*

The GPO concurs with this recommendation.

## Recommendation 12: Fall 1995 Meeting Site

Council weighed the following criteria in recommending a site for the Fall 1995 meeting.

* state that has never before hosted a Council meeting

* area with a concentration of depository libraries

* ease of transportation arrangements to the site

* as a potential site for a hearing on the FDLP

--Council member be local to assist in logistics

--opportunity to invite key Members of Congress

Based on these criteria, Council recommends that the Fall 1995 meeting be held in one of the following areas (local contact people in parenthesis):

- Anchorage, AK (Wilda Marston)

- Lexington or Louisville, KY (Cindy Etkin)

- Nashville, TN (Cindy Etkin)

- Raleigh-Durham, NC (Bobby Wynn)

(Additionally, the KY and TN sites would permit Council to invite staff from the Owensboro Storage Facility and/or the developers of the locator to participate in the meeting.)

### *Response*

The Fall 1995 meeting of the DLC will be held in Memphis, Tennessee, October 16-18, 1995. Unlike the other areas, Memphis has a number of hotels available during this time of the year, and they will honor government rates. The city is centrally located and has an international airport with good service from anywhere in the country.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University