## **DLC Digital Deposit Working Group Update - Transcript**

Please stand by for realtime captions.

Hello, everyone, we will start in about five minutes, this is the digital deposit working group update, thank you.

Welcome to the depository library council digital deposit working group update session. Before we handed over to the presenters I just want to remind you of a few things, in the lower right corner of your screen is a chat box and if you have any questions or comments or technical issues just pop those in the chat box and we will keep track of the questions and then when the presenters are finished, we are going to relay your questions to them so they can be answered.

Also remember that many of our presenters are using their WebCams for this conference and if you want to see that WebCam in an expanded view, inside the camera view itself, there is a little icon with a posing opposing arrows and click on that and it gets bigger and that is the top of your screen there is a blue bar and if you want to return to this default view, hover over it and click on return and you will get back to this view. Also we are recording each and every session and every one will get in their email link to the recording so with that I will handed over to our first presenter to get started.

Thank you, Kelly, I will turn my camera on and I am in the library today. So we are here to update all of you on the workings of the digital deposit working group and I will's start with our charge so this is the charge that we received by DLC in 2018, and I just want to note that digital deposit has been a topic of discussion within the FT LP since the early 2000's. It has also been a question that you might remember having seen an bilingual service so it kind of circles around every now and then and so the working group, after an informal discussion in 2016, decided it was more yes, it was something that deserved more discussion. And I just wanted to mention also that after the 2007 conference, GPO issued a digital distribution brief and in that brief it was noted that during the 2006 fiscal year, 93% of all new titles made available through the FT LP were made available in electronic form and the issue brief also offered information about push, pull models that libraries could utilize to receive content from GPO and it also outlined some assumptions issued and concerns related to digital depositor what they called in the pre-, digital distribution, the points made in the brief are still relevant today and have continued to be discussed in the group wanted more formally to address some of the assumptions, issues and concerns related to digital deposit, and we have broadened the focus somewhat from what the issue brief talked about and looking at pushing and pulling content to libraries, but it is still part of our charge and part of our what we are doing and we will talk a bout that a little more as we work through the presentation and then we have also -- some of what we have done is mostly focused on content to the GPO and we've also had discussions about what it might look like for agencies to push content to GPO but that is not anything that we are focusing on as part of our to deliverables of the group. I do want to highlight our members, and we organized in 2018 after we received that charge, at that time, Heather Christiansen and James Jacobs joined us as our community members. And then with our new class of DLC coming in, we welcome

Vicki and Julianne to our group and we are grateful to have them as part of our group they are bringing new life blood and fresh perspectives and a lot of energy to the group which we appreciate and enjoy.

I want to highlight what we have kind of done so far and I think the text on the slide is really small and I apologize for that so maybe if you are truly interested you can pull down the handouts and explore this more in depth and there are some links to some the things that we have produced so in 2019 we presented at the Spring virtual conference a session that we called digital deposit value proposition and it was in hopes to show the community the value of digital deposit and what it could mean for the collections going forward, what it would mean for possibly access and preservation going forward as well.

From there, we hosted sort of a focus group session at the fall 2019 conference, at that session we also presented three potential pilot projects and one is Lost Docs project and one was the agency submission to GPO which we talked about briefly and another is the digital deposit dissemination tool which would sort of facilitate that push, pool to library community, libraries in the community and then we had our focus group activity at the same session, where we shared a list of questions and got feedback from the community about how they made concerns or addressing some of those issues and concerns and assumptions around digital deposit.

And then in spring, we authored a pilot, proposed pilot project, to report which we presented to DLC and they approved at the pilot, and so, that brings us now to what we are working on, at this moment, we are working on a digital deposit think piece and you'll hear about that in just a moment. And then we are also working on the fugitive hunter pilot project and we will also discuss that further in this presentation. So with that, I think I am handing it over to James.

Let me see if I could make it work.

There you go, James, did I get you you got me, you are now presenter it says, I guess you got me.

## [Laughter].

Can everyone see me? Hello, everyone. Excellent. So thank you, Robbie Sittel, and thank you to everyone for letting us talked about digital deposit and as was noted early on our working group decided we needed to hash out a definition of digital deposit to guide our work and as we have heard, there might be some confusion in the community about what exactly that meant and what exactly we meant by digital deposit payment we came up with the following definition, that I think we shared in the 2019 DLC presentation, but I will reiterate it again, practices, services and workflows for the collaborative acquisition of born digital federal government information for our national collection of you as government information.

Originally went those of us in the FT LP community began talking about digital deposit what was meant was that digital content within scope of the FDLC should be deposited into FDLC

libraries. Just as paper and microforms had been and continue to be for the last 20 or do hundred plus years and it simply meant that GPO should treat digital and nondigital government information the same way but through our working group discussions and realizing that the nature of the formats have different collection preservation access

## [ Audio disconnected - please stand by while reconnecting]

In virtual collections and services. And I know we will be talking more about the effects of of cobra defended work later on so our group has had really great rich and detailed discussions about how digital deposit scenarios might work, but in order to make progress on really scoping out scenario that is both useful and practical, for libraries and GPO we need to dig into how things look from the stand point of libraries.

In addition to all of the feedback that we have had so far, from where we are now, what are specific needs? With details emerge when we look at this from a really practical and operational point of view?

So when aspect of our work will be case studies approach. We will conduct lightweight interviews, emphasis on lightweight with some representative libraries. And we have identified a number of different types of FDLC libraries to talk with such as preservation steward, regional selective, tribal library, law library, public library, and also we will consider the case of collaborative library organizations. May be pretty ambitious.

We will skip ahead to next light. So these types of libraries we are seeking to identify use cases draws a potential requirements at a high level so we could advise the auditory library council and GPO and we know that you all missed. The Pentagon but there it is.

## [Laughter].

So we have some ideas but we have not chosen specific representative libraries to interview yet or precisely define all the details of our case studies process. In the lightweight interviews, the kinds of questions we will explore our white digital deposit, what are the use cases that your library may dust my cow his your thinking change since the biannual survey? Also about content, what specific content did you want? How might you envision the selection process that would work for you? How would you make the digital content accessible to the public?

How would you envision the mechanics of digital deposit? And we talked about push, pull, or maybe even another route, physical format like a drive or DVD so what works for that particular library or what might work.

What kind of support our resources, technical, staff etc., Which are Lebron envision needing and what is already in place that your library that would support digital deposit swap pretty big question. And then what our collection management issues that you see, for example would

you expect to have retention requirements for digital documents, for example? And what might be prohibitive for your library?

So by these examples, you can see that while we are aiming to conceptualize overall we are also trying to get to the trade-offs from a really practical point of view.

So that is as far as we have gotten on the ink piece at this point and once we have accomplished interviews and information gathering, the digital deposit working group will then synthesize our findings into a report to the depository library council and the report is planned for spring of 2021 and hopefully that will be of interest to you all. So now I will hand it over to Vicki Tate, and she will talk about our current work on the fugitive hunter pilot project.

One moment here.

Move this over to Vicki.

Okay, thank you, Heather. The ball is now in my court. Okay, there we go, okay, sorry no video of me I am and my work computer and they do not have cameras so I will move forward with mine. Okay.

As stated before, the digital deposit working group has been charged by the DLC to look for what it might take to seek out potential fugitive documents that could be digitally deposited with GPO. Council recommendation number 1 from the spring 2020 meeting stated that GPO should work with the digital deposit working group to implement the digital deposit pilot to explore a full ecosystem approach to reporting loss documents to GPO as outlined in the document, digital deposit working group report, to the digital or the depository library council proposed pilot.

I believe the link to that is put in the chat if you're interested in that particular report. Now this pilot project wanted to look at the workflows for the collaborative acquisition of born digital federal government information for our national collection of you is government information.

The pilot has two main parts, actually hunting for digital fugitive documents and using focus groups to look at how people currently do their hunting and I will be focusing on the fugitive hunting component of the pilot project.

In July of this past year the working group sent out a survey request on the FDLC and the [ Indiscernible - low volume ] to find out about the experience government should libraries might have in finding and reporting fugitive documents. They were interested in several things but specifically how people find fugitive documents, what is done with them once they discover them? And how more effective deposit of this information with the you is government publishing office can be accomplished so that they may be catalogued and disseminated to federal depository libraries.

Beside the basic housekeeping items, there were 15 simple questions in the short survey how often do they look for fugitive documents and do you schedule time as part of your regular workflow to search for fugitive documents? If yes, how much time? Do you use any special tools or search techniques? If yes, what are they? If you learn of a fugitive document and search for it but do not locate it, to set up reminders to continue looking XT you download a copy of a found fugitive and if yes are they accessible to the public in digital form or are the printed out and added to the physical collection? You submit fugitive documents to ask GPO? If you do submit, do you watch the CGP to see if it has been added to the system?

And do you ever receive information from GPO that your submission is out of scope?

These are some of the basic questions we looked at. From this survey we received 138 responses. Now data from one of the questions quote, how often do you look for fugitive documents is illustrated in the pie chart. Now the largest group of respondents indicated they do not actively look for fugitives but they find them through serendipity. Or as is stated there, I don't look, they find me.

The next two groups either find fugitives occasionally, or rarely. The fourth largest group never finds fugitives in their day to day work. Now as indicated by this pie chart, there is one dedicated fugitive hunter who searched daily for possible fugitive documents. At the end of the survey, and ask for volunteers willing to work with the DG DD WG, as either focus group participant, or as a Hunter fugitive documents. Out of which out of the 138 survey response a, 42 responses indicated the willingness to participate and follow-up activities or about one third of the respondents. From the survey we were able to identify 23 volunteers willing to become fugitive hunters. This group includes members from the library community not surprisingly enough mostly government documents librarians as well as some of the actual members from the working group. To make this project more manageable, it was scoped to obtain the specific type of information and provide feedback to the DLC. For this project we are focusing on a congressionally mandated reports to Congress is in the house document 116-report known as reports to be made to Congress, as a base resource for identifying titles for inclusion in this program. House document 164 days of the report of agency should be provided to Congress. It gives the nature of the report, as well as the authorizing statute and when the report should be sent to Congress.

Since these reports were mandated by legislation, they should in theory exist. That they do not always become part of the depository program. Each of the volunteers were given a five departments to focus on with some overlap between the hunters. And for committing to this project we ask that all participants allow a segment of time each week towards a project so that there will be valuable information about how searching is done, and what is the outcome of their searching.

We are allowing about three months for this or all participants to search their assignments. So the project will run through the end of 2020 and with possibility of continuing until early 2021.

While doing the fugitive hunting aspect of the project, some of the metrics and feedback that we are analyzing our, what tools if any would utilized? How much time was spent searching? The number of documents searched in the number of documents discovered? And what barriers were encountered during the search as well as challenges that existed while searching how are we together the data to analyze? It was decided to create a former worksheet for each participant to fill out with information desired and the analysis -- for the analysis. Shown on this light is a sample of a completed work foreign. As you can see it is pretty detailed. Now the worksheet that was consisting of six sheets with the key tabs being workflow, excuse me, work form and data, and this is to be filled out by the hunter, description of the data element described in the work form, so everyone is working on the same -- same understanding of what is being searched for, house document 116-4 assignment given to a specific hunter and instructions on searching to help with how to begin the search. As you can see to help with group and the type of information into categories, this worksheet was color-coded. And I realize the details on this form is hard to see so I will just give you an overview. The green columns deal with session data and should be entered once in the top row of each fugitive hunting session. Each row of green fields will separate and signified the start of each fugitive hunting session.

The red columns is the information from house document 116-4 which could be copied and pasted from the house document spreadsheet. This should be entered in each report searched so you know what it is that you are searching for. The blue columns is information a voluntary actually finds themselves while hunting, such as the title of the report, whether or not it is in CGP, or OCLC record has been created.

As well as the URL to the report. The should be filled in for every report they search. Some of these will be in A's, not available, SCG record in the case of fugitives where as non-fugitive titles that are already part of the deposit -- depository program can be filled in with the CGA record.

Now the orange columns, this could either be session data or if someone changes their technique or comes across specific challenges for the reports can be entered into specific document they are searching. Such as where did you start your search? What search strategy did you use? Whether any tools utilized? Where the challenges judgment what with the challenges you encountered? And last, purple column is a common column that you could add any additional information you think that is relevant.

So each of these forms is what we will be using as the basis of the analysis once the project is over. So with that, I am done with my portion so I am now going to give the ball back to Robbie.

Okay.	
Thank you.	
Cannot turn my video back on.	

I will talk to us briefly about our focus group but we did get a question in the chat which I think is a really good one and I do want to address it as well. The other side of the pilot project for the fugitive hunters is the focus group and as we were developing the work form, the work form is really -- I will go back just to show it, is really the act of the hunting and how people might be identifying fugitives that they then submit to GPL so that is the community to the GPO aspect of the digital deposit but we also want to get feedback on what it is like for people to report those fugitives to GPO is the process that currently exist working or other better ways that they could be done or are the things that GPO could help to improve in the reporting process? So that was the basis of the focus group and we were able to host three focus group sessions with five participants per focus group. And we asked five questions on the screen, and I am going to just send out an appeal to the community and say that if you are an active fugitive hunter, and you were not able to commit time to participate in either the focus group or the hunter project, but you have time to answer these questions, I would encourage you to do so.

So if you want to take the five questions from the screen and think about it, and answer them, and send them to Cindy Etkin, see Atkin at GPO.gov she can share that with the working group and then we can further incorporate your feedback back into the recommendations that we make to DLC 20 end of our work.

And then I will finish with our deliverable since I segued into it and then I will go back and address Laura's question, this is what we hope to provide to the DLC in the coming months, so we will finish the digital deposit think piece, Heather James, Julia and Cindy will get that formalized, the working group together will provide thoughts and feedback on what they have done and then we will submit that to DLC for their dissemination to the community, so it is a work in progress and we will produce a report to our activities to date and I don't know that the deposit digital deposit working group will end at the end of the pilot and I hope not and hope it is something that the DLC feels is where the to continue. I think there is still work to be done around the issues and concerns related to digital deposit.

And the activities. And then, we also hope to provide a set of recommendations outcomes and output for council and those will include feedback to GPO and the fugitive reporting some of which we gathered through the focus groups and we also hope to maybe create or advocate for some of TLP Academy session on fugitive hunting and then we hope to also produce some fugitive hunting best practices which is a great lead into Laura's question so I to know if you guys sought in the chat, I will expand it, she says that she is new to government docs and welcome we are happy to have you and we have several participants in our focus groups and our fugitive hunting that are also new to docs so we are excited to have so many new folks joining us and the question is, our fugitive document something I should be looking for and how do I know whether or not document is fugitive? I am also going to plug Vicki session later this week, all about fugitive documents 101, so I am sure that will also shed more light on to the topic. No, I would say it is not something that you necessarily have to look for, as was indicated in the survey question, most often they seem to find people, and you know a document is fugitive went it is not in the CGP so that is sort of how we based the definition for the purpose of our pilot, and there are people that do actively hunt for them regularly and then there are

those that just go about their work and happen to find them along the way and then hopefully report them to the GPO so they can get catalogued and made accessible to the rest of us, for the purpose of our project, because it does seem to be such a serendipitous thing that is the -- in part why we scoped the document to the house document, and hopefully we will be able to report on this in the spring too quite often what you go hunting for is not necessarily what you find.

I think Vicki could attest to that too, because she has done this so far.

I would like to put in a comment and that, yes, of your interest in finding out what a fugitive is, them please tune into the Thursday program, in the afternoon, from the collective and discovery services working group and I will go through the difference between a depository item and a fugitive but I will warn you, if you do digital hunting, it is like eating potato chips, once you find when you cannot stop and you will just keep searching and the next thing you know, he found a whole bunch of them.

I would encourage anyone that is interested in this to please see that and then become a fugitive hunter with the rest of us.

And it can be serendipitous or it can be intentional, your choice.

That brings us to the end of our formal presentation. If there are questions from the community, we invite you to ask now or if anybody from our group has additional thoughts or comments, I would invite you to share those as well.

And and --

[Indiscernible - overlapping speakers]

A question from Chris and he wants to know when the pilot project interested only in the content or URL or did it also include print items?

That is a great question, and for the purpose of this pilot, because we are the digital deposit working group and we are concerned with digital born content that may fall through the crack's of GPO current processes of discovery, that is the focus for this pilot. Though I will say that in our focus groups, many of the respondents do not do per se fugitive hunting for digital born or born digital items. They are still working very much with tangible.

But we are hoping to change that [Laughter].

And yes, I think we need fugitive hander swag too.

And Robbie, Lana want to know in the digital depository project, do you go into detail about how to digitize documents?

We are not doing digitization of documents, so nothing that we are -- we are focused on a conversion from tangible to digital format, we are truly focused completely on born digital content so things that come from the agencies directly as a PDF or an HTML document, whatever it may be but whatever is out there in digital format.

That is a good idea, Pam [Laughter]. All right, GPO a green to be willing to help us find some swag or do we need to find money elsewhere?

[Laughter].

We need to go fund me.

We need a go fund me.

Yes, I agree, Alice, it is a very desperate I think Vicki said it correctly, she was -- we had a meeting last week and she noted that she spent 10 hours searching for fugitive documents one days are it is something that I think is a rabbit hole you fall down and have a hard time emerging out of.

Yes, only had to stop because I had to go home and feed my dogs.

Maybe that is a good thing [Laughter].

We need pets to save us from our work or children or whatever it may be.

Distract us, maybe, not save us.

Right, that is a great question as well, Darlene ask about digital individual library [Inaudible static] and the cost of that and that is quite true, there is cost related to it and it is not for everyone. Okay, thank you, Ellis, I will definitely repeat the question, so yes, criminally, I forgot, so Alice asked or stated that even doing government docs is very addictive process itself and once you find some information you do not want to stop until you find it all and that it is a Pandora's box and then Jenin ask that you address the individual library aspect of story digital documents and the related higher cost of that effort?

And so, yes, it is a cost issue at many libraries. And that is one of those concerns that was addressed in the 2007 brief, and I can pick up a link and share it and I didn't do it as part of the presentation and I apologize. And we know it is not for everyone and I think that that is also part of the approach of the think piece, is to say maybe it is not for everyone but if there are libraries that has that infrastructure, that can take on the digital content, especially -- now I am kind of talking out of turn -- but it it is something that GPO cannot host itself through government info, in order to ensure potential preservation and prolonged access, could

libraries step in to fill that role of holding that content on behalf, similarly to what we do with our tangible collections?

Ravi, can add something to that?

Please, yes.

Thank you, Darlene for that question, I think there are a lot of libraries out there that have for example institutional repositories or are using some sort of digital repository software for other materials, maybe materials focused on their organization, or their university, and those infrastructure can be used for the purposes of collection development as I do at my institution. As you do at you NT, Robbie.

Right.

If your library does have some digital repository software running, maybe you can ask if you can have a small slice of that for digital documents.

And that --

[Indiscernible - overlapping speakers]

Focused in your community.

Right, that was part of the value proposition that we presented, in spring 2018, it is of equal value to our to collections to have this digital content just as we have our tangible content and how do we inform our administrator and our IT keepers of all of our terabytes and petabytes of server space that this also is important content to, to host and provide access to?

And then Jenny says how but a ribbon for FDL batches -- I think that is a good fall 2021 goal is to have a hunter ribbon for the badges.

And then Kathy notes that some of the fugitives are because of cataloging and serial issues and of course that is something -- yes, that is something that we heard from our hunters thus far that when they are looking, they are finding cereals where some may be in the CGP and the others may not so I hope even though it may not have been an original intent of this group, that it does give GPO feedback on ways to improve processes or -- I no, just may be other things that the community can be doing to support their cataloging and discovery efforts.

And a ribbon would make a new be asking that they would all want to be a fugitive hunter [Laughter].

Thank you, James for posting that.

We will have to say thank you to Cindy and I just copy and pasted Cindy's post to us [Laughter] and I was just echoing Cindy.

I cannot multitask as well as some of the rest of you all, and presenting, so I apologize.

Robbie, this is Heather, I want to follow up on the earlier question from Darlene, bouncing around a little bit but in terms of thinking about the costs and what that would mean to an individual library, what we are hoping with this kind of case study approach is that we can look at different types of libraries to zero in on that a little bit more like what kind of libraries have capabilities and what really other trade-offs? So if you want to host some things that are important to you locally, is that something that is doable or is it sort of a whole kit and caboodle investment and I think we can explore that and maybe get at least to a point where we would be positioned to cost estimate later on and I think if we can just get further and really digging it and defining what all those trade-offs are four different types of libraries, which might be vastly different and I think that will be or could be really helpful to the community because you are looking at this as something I am interested in, well, you know what is it really going to cost me?

Yes, I mean cost right now for so many libraries in the midst of this -- I cannot even remember what Alecia said in the opening but yes, I am tired of the terminology too so I have just completely blocked it from my mind apparently.

But yes, we are all now even suffering were greatly that we were this time last year with regard to our library budgets. And so McMeekin the case may be that much more difficult for the foreseeable future.

Other comments or questions, thoughts, before we free you and to your next session?

I want to say thank you to everybody the came today and I think we had a pretty good turnout and the saw the numbers and then I lost it best was 200, awesome, thank you, guys, so much for joining us for our update. We are so grateful to everybody that has volunteered thus far to be part of the pilot project. We have a think a really great group of individuals that are out hunting for us. And a lot of new librarians into the document community and we are so grateful to have them too, so thank you to everybody that answered our survey and that is dissipating in one way or another and again if you are a hunter, and you want to answer our focus group questions, I do -- or if you report fugitives, you know whether you are a hunter or serendipitous finder, if you are reporting fugitives to the GPO, to consider taking a few moments to answer those questions, James, did you raise your hand for reason?

I did with my hand for a reason. I was hoping you would see that. Barbara had a question and I'm not sure if I can answer, but she says, is GPO considering reviewing or changing the scope of depository documents as well?

As far as I know, you know we have not had any discussion about scope for our digital deposit working group. Pretty much what is ever in scope now is going to continue to be in scope. GPO did just recently released a collection development policy document, and I think that kind of explains and highlights what their view of scope is. And how deeply they are collecting different kinds of documents so I would recommend folks to read that.

Cindy said she can address that. Can you change her role to a panelist please as far that is going on -- I would like to say that yes, in the fugitive 101 presentation I do address the concept of scope and what is in scope and what is out of scope.

If you're interested as the present policy, now I notice there are some things that were not in scope as tangibles, but no that they are digital, they are coming into golf info so that is a little bit of change there and there are things that used to not be of scope such as Congressional research service reports and outside of scope, but now they are part of the depository program so that does change but I will let Cindy give more details.

And while we wait for Cindy to be given yes, there you are, sorry, I was going to answer the next question but you go first.

Okay, I was not sure if I was on, can you hear me?

We can, yes.

Okay, Vicki touched on what I was going to say about the difference between the tangible and the digital environment for looking at scope. There are some things that are out of scope based on the definitions that were guided by internal 44, chapter 19, and for cataloging in chapter 17, but when materials are put on an agency's website, they are put on a publicly accessible website, they are then intentionally made publicly available for public consumption, which puts it smack dab in the middle of our scope so there are some of those things like administrative use only and if they put that up on the website that then becomes in scope. The same with the cooperative locations that they put it cooperative publication up on the website, they have determined they no longer need to be self-sufficient in pain for that particular publication, maybe they have already gained all of the money that they spent it producing a particular document and put it up on the website and that puts it in scope so it really is a difference between the tangible and the digital, which is changing, changing the scope.

Yes, and so, in the chat they have also -- Jamie has posted the scope document and Megan has shared the collection development plan that was recently posted so thank you both for that and just to address Robin's question, she asks if a list of found fugitives to this project will be made available and I would say yes, we are still in process of the pilot project. We have asked her to countries to not report anything they are finding to GPO until the pilot is completed. And so, we hope to make that information available as probably part of our report to the DLC of our activities and then just as a side note, because we are using the house document, even though Cindy has noted that anything on a public website should be in scope, these two should also

definitely be in scope and would've been things that should've been funneled through GPO and a print process of production, and so, in finding things that should be in the CGP, we are ready are kind of amazed at what we have already discovered thus far. And it is to no one's fault that it is not part -- not currently available in the CGP. It just a guess -- it will hopefully help to inform why they are getting missed, but we don't know, we will see. That is the exciting part, right? Maybe [Laughter].

All right, we're eight minutes ahead of the are and any additional questions, final thoughts?

And James shared a recent fugitive -- Jenny is asking about the national park newsletter. Sorry, somebody is knocking on a window.

I don't know, Jenny, if that is electronic -- it is electronic. Well, I would encourage you to submit it to GPO, through askGPO and see if use find a response it has been catalogued or out of scope and report back to us.

Especially if you send them a digital file, they could put it up on their local server and there accessor.

If it is in scope.

All right, I want to say thank you to everyone for joining us today and continue to follow our progress and we hope to share in April some of the findings from the pilot project, and perhaps additional next steps for the working group, so thank you all so much.

Many thanks to our presenters for this great session. We will be back at 4:15 in this room is the session on the DLC Perl working group delight Prill on that and in the other meeting room, is a session on strategic weeding so if you need to switch rooms you can refer to what you received over email and that is also handily available for you on FD LP.gov on the event page and there is a whole link to the document that has all of the URLs for every session and we will see everyone at 4:15, thank you.

[ Event concluded ]