DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE

APRIL 15, 2007

_____

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Good afternoon. I'm Bill Sudduth.

I want to welcome you to the 69th Meeting of the Federal Depository Library Council of the Public Printer here in Denver, Colorado.

I'd like to call this meeting to order.

I want to open by dedicating this meeting to Ridley Kessler, who served on council from 1987 to 1990 and was chair from 1989 to 1990.

For me, Ridley was a teacher, a mentor, a colleague and collaborator, and I know that he's sorely missed by myself and others who frequently called on him for advice, wisdom and humor.

Over the course of his 30 plus year career, Ridley was a passionate advocate of public access to government information and the promotion of the Federal Depository Library Program to a democratic society.

Many of you will remember Ridley as that grand individual that would get up and ask the question we all wanted to ask. He showed us that it's okay to ask why the emperor has no clothes. But Ridley earned the right to do so, because he spent a lot of time

listening, putting the pieces together and had the timing to strike when it was right. Ridley loved to come to these meetings for many reasons -- to see friends, to continue mentoring former students and meet new colleagues, and, of course, to go to a baseball game.

The council was Ridley's semi-annual opportunity to make this grand partnership between depository libraries and GPO work better for the people of this nation.

Now, I'd like to have the members of council introduce themselves.

RICHARD AKEROYD: I'm Richard Akeroyd. I'm the state librarian in New Mexico.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Katrina Stierholz. I'm the director of library and research information services at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

ANN MILLER: I'm Ann Miller, head of public documents and maps, Duke University.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Evelyn Frangakis, chief of preservation at the New York Public Library.

DENISE DAVIS: Denise David, director of the office of research and statistics with the American Library Association.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne, head of government

publications library, University of Colorado.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: I'm Bill Sudduth. I'm at the University of South Carolina.

SUSAN TULIS: Susan Tulis, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

WALTER WARNICK: I'm Walt Warnick with the U. S. Department of Energy, director of the office of scientific and technical information.

DENISE STEPHENS: I'm Denise Stephens, vice provost for information services and chief information officer, University of Kansas.

MARK SANDLER: Mark Sandler. I'm the director of the center for library initiatives at the CIC, which is the midwest library consortium.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Jeff Swindells. I'm the head of government documents, maps and data services at the University of Missouri.

PETER HEMPHILL: Peter Hemphill of Hemphill and Associates, a Nikki consulting firm.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Council is composed of 15 members. We actually have a current vacancy on the council. Linda Saferite resigned her position between the fall and the spring meeting. And we also have one member who is absent, Marian Parker, who is at Wake Forest University School of Law, was unable to

attend because of illness.

Now it's time for council to get a sense of you all, the audience, who's here. We like to call this section council aerobics. For those of us who've been attending these meetings for several years, we like to report this activity back to our cardiologists and orthopedics as vigorous activity.

First, I'd like those of you who are attending the Depository Library Council meeting for the first time to please stand.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Welcome.

Now I ask those members in the audience who attended the Depository Library Council before 1990 to stand. Anybody who -- okay.

You newer folks can talk to those experienced folks that can tell you about the good old days.

Former council members who are in the audience? The regional depository librarians who are here?

Of course, this is a reminder for those of you who are selectives to set up your lunch date with your regional either tomorrow or Tuesday. I know a couple of states are going out Tuesday because of the schedule issues, but, again, if you haven't had a chance to meet your regional, here's the chance to go

out and have lunch with them either tomorrow of

Tuesday.

Those of you who are from public libraries?

State libraries? Law libraries? And academic

libraries?

Okay. And, of course, the question I think

Dan started asking this -- Barkley -- how many of you

received full funding to attend? Congratulations.

Partial funding? Okay. And those of you who are

putting this on your plastic -- no funding?

And, again, an important purpose of this

meeting is to interact with the folks in GPO, so those

who are with the GPO staff, if you would please stand?

Again, a reminder, if you have any problems

with name badge or packet, getting lost in the hotel

because we're on two sides, crossing the street, under

the street, whatever, there's Lance in the back and, of

course, Nick and Yvonne are at the table, and don't

hesitate to ask them any questions or if you have any

kind of emergencies, let them know. They're here to

help us. They've done a wonderful job so far, and I

know they'll continue to do that as the conference goes

on. So, thank you.

Okay. In your packet you received a lot of

information. Oh -- actually before I get on -- before

I go any further with that, I know there is one GPO

staff member who's not here and we usually see, and

that's Robin Haun-Mohamed, and she was unable to

attend because of some health issues. So we will miss

Robin, and I'm sure Ric will let us know more tomorrow

how Robin's doing, but I've heard that she is back on

the Blackberry and driving them crazy. Right, Lance?

LANCE: Yes.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: So, okay. There's a lot of

information in your packet. Take your time, looked

through it. One of the most important pieces that I

think are in your packet is the list of registrants and

your list of speakers. There's information there that

you can use to contact these individuals after the

conference so you can continue that dialog with the

individuals.

So, take the chance, look through your

packet. Of course, what is important is the schedule.

We have -- this is kind of a dual arrangement. We have

council for the plenary sessions that we will be in

this room.

When we have plenary sessions, it is a chance

for GPO and council to interaction and for council to

do its business which is to advise GPO and the public

printer on where they're headed. But there's also

educational tracts.

So, you know, let's just briefly go over that. As I said, the full information is in your packet. Monday, tomorrow morning, we have our GPO update, and that's followed by the featured digital system update.

In the afternoon, there is a council plenary session on electronic services, the new FDLP desktop. Tuesday and Wednesday the plenary sessions will be presented by GPO staff and a council member, and these will include digital distribution, training, web harvesting.

And then Tuesday afternoon, we'll have an open forum. Open forum is for those questions that the audience, you the audience, were unable to ask at the end of any of the previous sessions.

Again the way sessions are run is that GPO presents information, council asks questions first. Sometimes council has lots of questions and we run out of town. Sometimes council doesn't have that many questions. We'll open the floor up. But also it's a time that if you walk out on Monday or earlier in the day Tuesday and say, "Oh, gee, I wish I could have asked that question." Open forum will give you that opportunity to do that. All of GPO's staff will be

here and most of council will be here also.

Wednesday, we conclude with a session on digitization and then a session on assessments. So, we should have an interesting concluding half day.

Tuesday and part of Wednesday we also have educational and agency sessions. Monday there are sessions on minding the intangible wealth of your community. Land grant, depository centennial celebrations that are going on. I give it's 30 plus libraries or something like that. And a lot of good opportunities to find out about these depositories and also how they're organizing their celebrations.

Also, there's going to be models of virtual cooperative public services and also a session on changing work place.

Tuesday is going to be agency day. We have Internal Revenue Service which they're going to have a busy enough day that day anyway. I did have a -- I don't know if it was a dream or whatever, but what they did is they came in and they recruited us and gave us boxes and we all stood out by the post office the rest of the day. No, thank you.

Occupational Safety and Health, General Services administration and USGS, United States Geological Survey, will have folks here on Tuesday.

And then Wednesday the educational sessions conclude
with a session on instruction, training and promotion.
And a second session on care and weeding of a
collection.

Also in your packet, you will see information
about Monday evening's reception at the Colorado
History Museum. There is -- it's not that far away.
It's within distance. And I'd like to thank all the
folks who have worked on that and put together. I
believe Tim had a piece in this and not real --

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible] delegating.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: -- delegating, delegating.

And then Tuesday evening from 7:00 to 9:00
p.m. go to work, and the SOA Division on government
information is going to have a session on exploring the
"E" in E-government.

Council has been working with GPO on several
areas. In particular we're focusing on the areas
reflected in the plenary sessions during the
conference. And during the meetings, you will notice
that all the plenary sessions on Tuesday and Wednesday
will be co-presented by GPO staff and a member of
council.

Council is in the process of finalizing some
recommendations for GPO and the Federal Depository

Library community related to the vision document and current initiatives at GPO.

In brief, these recommendations cover the need to establish a registry of depository librarians, strengthening GPO's partnership with libraries and institutions on digitization projects, the need to make fugitive electronic documents searchable by GPO access through web harvesting, encourage GPO and federal depository libraries to utilize OPAL to facilitate the training and products and services available, redesign the Federal Depository Library Program web page and encourage the depository community to create in GPO to host a web-based platform to support collaboration, communication and community building among depository libraries. As you can see, most of these have to do with and focus very heavily on the important partnership that we have.

As part of the theme which we have in the conference this time which is a very good thing is partnership. We have invited Peter R. Young to speak to us on the area or on the topic of partnership.

Peter R. Young was appointed director of the national agriculture library in June of 2002. He leads and directs NAL's programs and the agricultural, natural, life and related sciences serving the U.S.

Department of Agriculture and the nation with an annual
budget of over 20 million dollars and a staff of 250
plus individuals. From 1997 to 2002, Young served the
Library of Congress as the chief of the cataloging and
distribution service and acting chief of the Asian
division. From 1990 to 1997, he served as executive
director of the United States National Commission on
Libraries and Information Science, better known to us
as NCLIS, an independent executive branch agency,
advising the President and Congress on library and
information service policies.

          Mr. Young's career includes positions in
national and academic and research libraries. He
directed Faxson's academic information services. Also
at the Library of Congress he had additional managerial
positions as to the chief of copy cataloging, assistant
chief of the mark editorial division and the CDS
customer services office. Mr. Young has also been
assistant librarian from public services at Rice
University, reference librarian and head cataloger at
Franklin and Marshall College, administrative librarian
at American University and assistant director of the
Grand Rapids, Michigan public library.

          He's a native of Washington, D.C. Mr. Young
holds an AB degree in literal arts, philosophy from the

College of Wooster in Wooster, Ohio and an MSLS degree
from Columbia University School of Library Science.

He served as a film library specialist with
the 25th Infantry Division of the U.S. Army in 1968-
1970, and was awarded three Bronze Star medals for
meritorious achievement directing the Special Services
library in Tu Chi [phonetic], Vietnam.

Mr. Young is a member of the American Library
Association and has served on committees of LITA, LAMA,
RTSD, PLA and on the American Library Association
council and as president of the Chinese-American
Library Association and co-chair of the Library
Statistics and Standard Revision Committee Z-39.7, the
National Standards Information Organization or NSIO.

He headed the U.S. delegation to the FEO
Consultation on agricultural information management and
has recent articles on Information Tools and Threats at
Special Libraries Association conference, Electronic
Services in Library Performance, a Definitional
Challenge. He also has a public -- oh, those are
publications, Librarian Shift: A Changing Profession
and Balancing Post-Modern Academic Libraries.

Mr. Young's talk today is titled
"Partnerships in a Digital World: Rethinking our
Roles," and will touch on many of these topics.

Thank you.

PETER YOUNG: Thanks, Bill, for that marvelous introduction. I hope none of you went to sleep during that, because I think it sort of was a test to see whether or not you guys are going to go to sleep or not this afternoon; right?

I've got the text here to read, but as I understand it, when Robin called me and told me I was going to be here, she said I had 45 minutes; right?

And so I basically said, "Okay, I can do 45 minutes" but, you know, I got in last evening, and I've been spending my time today in an uninterrupted Sunday, shall we say afternoon, and I've got 26 slides, but I've got about, you know, four minutes, maybe 10 minutes per slide; right? So we're going to be here a long time. But I was informed that you guys -- you guys, if I finish early, then you ask questions. Is that correct? Is that the custom here?

So I was going to suggest we could take even longer. You can ask questions as we go. How's that? Can I negotiate that as a ground rule if you're right up front? Do you have any questions?

Okay. I have one of you. I've got two series of jokes. Right? Think about it. If you want the jokes all up front, option A; if you want the jokes

some up front and some at the end, option B; or do you

not want the jokes at all, option C?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible] interspersed.

PETER YOUNG: Oh, you want it interspersed.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Yeah, an option D.

PETER YOUNG: Oh, this is tough, option D.

So, let's hear it vocally, option A? Nobody wants them

all up front.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [laughter]

[indecipherable]

PETER YOUNG: You want [laughter]

[indecipherable] up front. Option B is some up front

and some at the end. You like that, okay.

Now, Option C which is no jokes at all. Oh,

tough group. Okay, Evelyn is disbursed. Disbursed

jokes?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Yes.

PETER YOUNG: Wait a minute, wait a minute.

All right, all right.

I'll tell you what. I've got to read some of

this stuff, otherwise I'll forget all these things I

have to say. Let me read some of this stuff, and I

then I'll take some jokes at the beginning --

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: In the middle.

PETER YOUNG: In the middle and the end.

How's that? I think it -- it -- so here we go starting
all over again.

Good afternoon. And thanks for that great
introduction, Bill. [laughter] That's not a joke.
It's great to join all of you here in Denver for this
spring meeting of the Depository Library Council for
the Public Printer. And why are we inside on a day
like today. Good Lord, I don't know what your winter
has been like or your late spring, but ours has been
not pleasant. And coming here yesterday evening was
like, you know, this is where they invited spring,
right? But today is just gorgeous, so maybe that's an
argument for ending early so we can outside.

Okay, here we go. I know it's Sunday, and
it's also, of course, April 15, but this year the IRS
doesn't take us until Tuesday; is that right? But
since I am a federal employee, I ought to know that;
right? And you all are familiar with the federal
regulations beyond anyone's imaginable dream; right?

I have to say that my presentation this
afternoon reflects my own ideas and does not
necessarily represent the polices or positions of the
National Agricultural Library of the U.S. Department of
Agriculture or the federal government. We're done with
that. Does anybody have any questions about that?

However, I do want to acknowledge they had a lot of help with this presentation from specifically Carl Ducus Lopez, the National Ag Library's chief collection development officer, and also from Donna Harrendeen [phonetic] who if I were not here, she would be here, because I bumped her in terms of using this year's FY-07 appropriation to join you here. But Donna's head of the NAL's Gibson Exchange. I also want to thank my friend -- I was going to say old friend, but I think long-term friend, Richard Akeroyd, for suggesting that I come talk with you. And for also to Robin, who is not here, for her help with arrangements.

Now, I'm going to try something that may or may not work. Yes, it does. Fantastic, tell me you did it. You get a beer later on. We've had some challenges in putting together this presentation for you, but you can all see we succeeded at our challenges.

Now, right? Before we get into exploring partnerships in a digital world, rethinking our roles, I want to share a few items with you taken from real life. And as I shall we say share these with you and I'm only going to share half of them with you now, I want you sit and ponder these questions. Can you guys read this stuff; right? The questions are -- you can

read it -- what is the role of the FDLP system and aid

of its global digital networks and what would be the

consequences if FDLP going out of existence. Okay. So

you need to ponder those questions, because they'll

come up again.

But, first, one of my favorites is the

sampling of statements taken from actual insurance

accident claim forms. Right? And really the message

here that these claim forms represent, shall we say,

kind of an inspiration for the idea that you can be

really creative. So here are some of the incidents

with pedestrians, the way people report their

accidents. First, "The pedestrian ran for the pavement

but I got him." Next, "The guy was all over the road.

I had to swerve a number of times before I hit him."

Next, "I was sure the old fellow would never make it to

the other side of the when I struck him." "The

pedestrian had no idea which way to run as I ran over

him." "The car in front hit the pedestrian, but he got

up again and so I hit him again." And "I saw her look

at me twice. She appeared to making slow progress when

we met on impact."

These are accidents with other vehicles. "A

truck backed through my windshield and into my wife's

face." These are very selective now. "I was backing

my car out of the driveway in the usual manner when it was struck by the other car in the same place it had been struck several times before." "The gentleman behind me struck me on the back side. He then went to rest in a bush with just his rear end showing." Think about that. Don't think about that.

"Coming home I drove into the wrong house and collided with the tree I didn't have." "I told the police that I was not injured. When removing my hat, I found that I had a fractured skull." "I thought my window was down but I found it was up when I put my head through it." "In an attempt to kill the fly, I drove into a telephone pole." "The telephone pole was approaching. I was attempting to swerve out of the way when it struck me in the front end." "I pulled into the side of the road because there was smoke coming out from under the hood. I realized there was a fire in the engine, so I put my dog and smothered it with a blanket." Do we have an educational challenge or what? Maybe it's simpatico, I don't know.

"I didn't think the speed limit applied after midnight." I like that excuse. "The indirect cause of the accident was a little guy in a small car with a big mouth." You ever had that happen? Never mind.

"I was on the way to the doctor with my rear

end trouble when my universal joint gave way causing me to have an accident." "The accident was caused by me waving to the man I hit last week." This has got to be an award for succinctness. "Windshield broke. Cause unknown. Probably hoo doo." "The accident happened when the right front door of the car came around the corner without giving a signal." "I had been driving for 40 years when I fell asleep at the wheel and had an accident." "An invisible car came out of nowhere and struck my car and then vanished." "I knew the dog was possessive about the car, but I would not have asked her to drive it if I had thought there was any risk. My daughter was driving the dog." And finally, "The accident happened because I had one eye on the truck in front and one eye on the pedestrian and the other on the car behind."

You guys voted for these things to be interspersed, right, so I'll save a few comments for later. When attention starts to wane, let me know by raising your hands or better yet by flapping your eyes, and I'll read some other items that -- that I selected because I thought that they would keep you guys awake this afternoon.

So partnerships in an individual world rethinking our roles. Have you been thinking about the

two questions? Anybody have any questions about the

questions? Anybody have any answers about the

questions? It's going to be a long afternoon.

So, let's go through here and think further

about some additional questions like how could we

restructure the FDLP partnership to meet 21st century

needs, and what roles do GPO and FDLP and the

Depository Library Council have to perform when federal

information is accessible directly from the agencies.

And obviously we have seen that over the past several

years in spades in terms of the government initiative.

And what elements have made federal partnerships work

in the past?

Many of the responses to these questions are

discussed within the marvelous document that you guys

know a lot about. Right? Knowledge will forever

govern. And I wanted to ask you about syntactical.

Who put this together so that the knowledge will govern

forever? No. Knowledge will forever govern. What is

-- what is this -- you're laughing at this.

ANN MILLER: You can blame James Madison.

It's his quote.

PETER YOUNG: Who?

ANN MILLER: You can blame James Madison.

It's his quote.

PETER YOUNG: It's James Madison's?

ANN MILLER: Yes.

PETER YOUNG: God bless him. I always liked James Madison. Forever knowledge will govern. No, forever govern will knowledge. Right? James Madison, that's his; that's marvelous. So the subtitle essentially also is a vision statement for the Federal Depository Libraries in the 21st century dated 29 September 2006. You guys know this; correct? You've been immersed in it; right? So how many specific initiatives are included in the document?

ANN MILLER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: Right, right. So that's what you're planning to do here; right? You're moving to action; right? Mission vision values and then action; right? So you put together a strategic plan for depository libraries down to the 21st century here in Denver for this meeting; correct? Am I wrong? Bill, correct me. I thought that was the action purpose here in terms of getting to work; to begin to plan for what it is the vision is and how that vision can then be translated into action for, shall we say, rethinking our roles in the partnerships of the 21st century.

Do you want the other jokes now?

No, that is correct; right? You come to

these meetings essentially to not simply listen to
these 15 people talk together but to actually in the
partnership discussion dialog necessary so that you can
evolve into the future? You guys are either not very
interactive or I have too high of expectations. Is it
correct that you're here to work; put it that way?

          AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Yes.

          PETER YOUNG: Okay. Not just to shop; right?
Once again, it is correct that you are here to work;
yes?

          AUDIENCE: Yes.

          PETER YOUNG: I like it too. Immediately
challenged to read upon the program, and by the way our
library role's in that program. I want to reflect on
our bit of a past history for listens. I thought about
what's essential from partnerships, from past
partnerships to succeed. And I believe one recall and
Donna that the -- there are six elements, at least six
elements involved in successful partnerships.

          Now stare at these stones for a minute.
Right? What's important about these stones? It's
their balance it looks like. It didn't include your
elements of successful partnerships that they have to
be in balance, but I think it's a critical thing in
terms of shall we say the experiment that we all live

within which is the experiment called democracy in
America, that there be balance between the federal and
the states sectors; correct? You guys have read your
history and the founding fathers pretty carefully.
That is essentially the challenge of this nation -- to
balance the rights of the state and the rights of the
federal government.

And what we have here is a partnership
between the federal government and agency of
legislative branch of both Government Printing Office
and the states, your institutions, that is the majority
of which are academic state and land grant universities
I believe, and how that balance, shall we say, needs to
look towards the future in terms of successful
partnerships.

So let me run fairly quickly and just sort of
explicate -- you don't mind that do you -- I mean being
an old philosophy major, I'm -- I tend towards
explication, but also I'll get into dialectic in a
minute. You guys know about that?

We'll do explication first. First, I want to
explore these six elements. Right? This is my
dialectic, and I'll do that with you.

And then I'm going to look at both the FDLP
and the land grant university partnership from an

historical perspective. Okay, so that's second.

Third, I'm going to discuss the six elements for both

the FDLP and land grant university programs. You get

the idea here? It's beginning to flesh out.

Fourth, I'm going to review the 21st century forces of

change affecting both FDLP and land grant university

partnerships.

Fifth, I'm going to mention possible ways to

re-balance. Here we go, the stones in balance; right?

The elements to assure that these federal partnerships,

that is with FDLP in mind, bring university

partnerships, will succeed into the future.

Sixth, I'm going to look a little at how NAL

is meeting the challenges of the future with digital

technologies and partnerships.

And, seven, I'm going to touch on how GPO and

the Depository Library Council and FDLP can work to

transfer to the 19th century partnerships into the

future. Right?

Any questions? You ready for the other jokes

here? No.

ANN MILLER: Not yet.

PETER YOUNG: Say what?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: Oh. You want me to slow down a

little bit? I will speak very slowly. I'll talk first about mutual interests. Is this better? No. Okay.

Mutual interests, this partnership element is about enlightened self-interests. Right? Where groups act to further the interests of others and ultimately serve to bring long-term benefits. So what's -- what's the impacted message here about mutual interests? That they are long term. They're not short-term gains, but they're long-term investments.

And how old is the depository library system? Some say you date to 1813 I believe. Okay? 1863, I like that better. And how old is the land grant university system? I'm getting ahead of myself? 1862, thank you. And who was President in 1862?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: And what was Lincoln's middle name? No one knows, because he didn't have one.

Shared values interest -- this is the second elements. This element reflects a common ideal worth or importance that is common among several groups of communities. Inherent in this element is that competence serves as a foundation of the partnership and relations. I can't emphasize enough that I tried to put these together not in terms of the priority or hierarchy, but rather in terms of what I view as, shall

we say, one developing out of the other. So out of
mutual interests, it depends upon shared values and
trust.

Those shared values and trusts develop into
the complimentary nature of diverse strengths, the
third element. And this partnership element recognizes
that a successful partnership requires the blending of
different elements to form a whole. Right? Pieces of
a whole? This blending involves non-competitive
integration of forces or powers that is strengthened by
variation or diversity. And, Lord, do we have a nation
full of diversity.

I was walking yesterday evening out, just
down -- what is the road -- Sixteenth Avenue, is that
it at the mall there? And there is an incredible
diversity in Denver. Right? I mean some of you come
from urban environments, other rural environments, but
I haven't been to Denver in about two years.

I usually go out of Denver airport and
straight up to Fort Collins, because that is a ag
research up there, and I bypass Denver, at least in
terms of the traffic here. So this is the first time
I've been in this city.

This is a really interesting major urban
city. There are elements blended here both racially,

as well as culturally, as well as age specific, as well as tourist, and there are, shall we say, styles in abode, both of dressing and piercing that I haven't seen in a long time. But you guys are on campus, so you see this all the time.

The fourth element is reliability. This element is about the ability of a system to perform and maintain functions in routine circumstances. We all know routine circumstances. That's what librarianship is all about; right? It's repetitive activity over and over again, mark it and park it. And you're not saying "yes?" Well, maybe that's what we started in this field like several decades ago when I was in library school.

You didn't mention I went to Columbia did you?

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Yes.

PETER YOUNG: Yes, you did. It's curious, you know; everything I've gone to like Columbia, they shut down the school. Right? The National Commission they shut it down. Both my divisions in the Library of Congress they're shutting down. I'm wondering whether this is a curse following me. Do you see something in back of me? Every time I leave something, it goes down. Well, I didn't want to talk about that.

Reliability is a real crucial factor here. As you can see, it's the fourth element. The fifth element and the sixth element are to me probably ones of the most important elements of elements of successful partnership. The fifth element is flexible and evolving. This element reflects a ready capacity to adapt the new, different or changing requirements by a process of -- here's the phrase -- continuous change, growth and development. Friends, are our libraries positioned for continuous change, growth and development? Huh? Huh?

I remember reading LC-21 a few years ago when LC got it's 100 million dollars for the National Information Infrastructure Preservation Development Program; remember that? And essentially the preamble to that, the preface said basically the Library of Congress can choose to become a dynamic force in the future or it can basically revert to its prior mission and become a museum books; right? Are we flexible and evolving? Do we wish to be flexible and evolving? How do we get to flexible and evolving? Because the last element is something is called grand leadership.

This element of leadership recognizes the need to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of the

partnership. It's probably not the last element but probably the most important element, and it's the element I think that's reflected in our meeting here in Denver by the council, as well as the partnership with FDLP. Transformation of leadership incorporates the other six elements, but incorporates also vision, and you have that, friends, in this knowledge will forever govern -- thank you, Mr. Madison -- but it also involves the implementation and execution of that vision.

Let me quote from James MacGregor Burns. You know this guy? He's a biographer both of FDR, as well as, shall we say, some people more recently in terms of the Clintons, but basically he says: "The ultimate test of practical leadership is the realization of intended real change that meets people's enduring needs." Burns was a Pulitzer prize-winning presidential biographer and runs now a center at the University of Maryland for transformation of leadership.

So where are we with these six elements? You guys have memorized these things? Right? You've taken them to task. You understand the dialectic; right? Are you ready for the second joke? I have to do better than that. All who are ready say yes?

                    AUDIENCE: Yes.

                    AUDIENCE SPEAKER: No.

                    PETER YOUNG: Well you know who has it;

right?

                    Okay. Here we go. Second, since we

discussed these partnerships with our federal

government, then I want to share some actual comments

taken from performance evaluations given by federal

supervisors to those poor people who work for them.

This may or may not be real. "Has two brains. One is

lost and the other is looking for it." Easy now. I'm

sure you don't have staff that work for you that get

these type of evaluations. "Since my last report, this

employee has reached bottom and has started to dig?

You do have someone on your -- never mind.

                    "Sets low personal standards and

inconsistently fails to achieve them." Exceeding;

right?

                    "The employee is depriving the village

somewhere of an idiot." "Gates are down, the lights

are flashing, but the train isn't coming."

                    AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

                    PETER YOUNG: No, these are not [inaudible]

office. These are public funds.

                    AUDIENCE SPEAKER: That's the best joke.

PETER YOUNG: "If you see two people talking
and one looks bored, he's the other one." These are
kind of generic actually. "The wheel is turning, but
the hamster is dead."

I've had a long career. Actually, I've had
two long -- never mind.

"If you stand close enough to him, you can
hear the ocean." "He would argue with a signpost."
"Doesn't have ulcers, but is a carrier." Sorry,
"Doesn't have ulcers, but is a carrier." There we go.
"This young lady has delusions of adequacy." "This
employee should go far and the sooner the better."
"Got a full six-pack, but lacks the plastic thing to
hold it all together." We may have to take a break in
the middle here.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: Okay.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: I hope you enjoy this
afternoon. "When his IQ reaches 50, he should sell."
"When she opens her mouth, it seems only to change
feet." I have to look somewhere. I can't watch Evelyn
anymore.

"Donated his brain to science before he was
done using it." "One neutron short of a synapse."

"It's hard to believe that he beat a thousand other sperm." "If he were more stupid, he'd have to be watered twice a week." And lastly, "This employee is really not so much of a has-been as a definite won't be." So that is your tax dollars at work.

So let's then go through the elements of successful partnerships. And I really wanted to talk, as you've heard from the dialectic, the Department of Agriculture in terms of what it is that the department has been with land grant universities since 1862 when the organic statute establishing the USDA was signed by?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: And what was it called? The Murrell Act? Right? Murrell was a senator from Vermont; right? And what happened to the first Murrell Act when it was introduced into Congress? It was vetoed by Lincoln's predecessor who was?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Buchanan.

PETER YOUNG: Buchanan, correct. This is a history lesson for all of you. This organic statute essentially was signed by Abraham Lincoln. And it's fascinating to read the language marked 21st Century perspective, because essentially it set up the Department of Agriculture, and at the seat of the

government in the United States, the general designs and duties of which the department shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information. So right up front, the USDA was created to disseminate useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word and to procure, propagate and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

So essentially the USDA was created to propagate and distribute seeds and plants, but it was first created not only to distribute seeds and plants but to distribute information with regard to these agricultural activities.

NAL was established at the Department of Agriculture in 1862 with that organic statute as the USDA library. And as I mentioned, the Murrell Act of 1862 created the federal and state cooperative partnership with USDA. We have the federal government USDA with state land grant universities.

An 1813 act, as you know, established the Government Printing Office and insured the provision of one copy of documents in universities and historical societies and state libraries. And I believe that was created in the Department of Interior, rather than the

legislative branch GPO.

The Superintendent of Documents of 1869 was established and began distribution of paper documents. And a lot of you, as -- or my library at NAL became a depository in 1895. I think there's a celebration that's being planned at this meeting to celebrate land grant depository centennial to commemorate the centennial of 43 land grant institutions entering the depository program. Right? So you land grant universities, which ones are you? There should be 43 hands in the room; right?

So that centennial is really important in terms of marking the last century, but hopefully, it's a centennial that won't simply mark the past in terms of the last century, but look forward to the future.

And I think Mary Ann Ryan, associate dean for learning at Purdue, right? And Katherine Jersey [phonetic] of Lexis/Nexis academic and library solutions are coordinating the program tomorrow at 1:30 to 3:00 -- is that correct? Are you guys in the room? You want to wave and pad for your program to do a commercial moment? I'll do it for you. Thank you. Looking forward to that.

This is a great way to make a successful partnerships of the last century to mark them and to

hopefully plan for the future.

Let's look at the common elements of partnership in relation to the -- remember the common elements, the six common elements -- did you memorize those already? Can you feed them back to me now?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Mutual interests. Thank you, Jo Ann. Yes?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Shared values.

PETER YOUNG: Shared values. You wrote them down?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Yes.

PETER YOUNG: Fabulous. So take those six elements and then parse those against -- hang on a second -- the federal depository library program and land grant universities, LGU's. First of all, mutual interests, educating and informing the public in disseminating information. Those mutual interests essentially are between both the federal government and the state government, both in FDLP and land grants, so you get one element.

Shared values and trust -- safeguarding the public's right to know, equity of access, free and unrestricted, unstructured public use.

Other elements include complimentary and diverse strengths. The federal and state cooperative

partnership program and provides the basis for evolving

cooperative projects. What's interesting about this is

that the program itself is the platform for a variety

of different projects along the way to build one.

We've certainly done that within USDA in terms of

program relationship between the federal government and

land grant universities. There's a whole host of

additional legislation that creates flows of both money

on forming the grants but also competitive grants. But

also there's a whole host of other initiated

cooperative projects in the FDLP program building on

the program itself for depository distribution.

Element of reliability include trust

information sources. And, Lord, if we can't trust the

federal government on income tax day, who can you

trust? Right?

As well as standards and procedures,

structures and requirements, as well as mutual

investments and those standards are becoming extremely

important in terms of the churn of technology based

activity in a network environment. So those are

relative complementary. These are the two that I

wanted to emphasize -- the elements of flexible and

evolving and the elements of leadership.

In FDLP, I want to focus on changing formats

every time. When I was at Franklin and Marshall
College library in the late 70's -- I'm sorry, early
70's, excuse me, we had a depository library program at
F&M that was transitioning from paper-based activity to
-- what is it in the 70's that we were using again -- I
can't remember the name of it?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Microfiche, I think.

PETER YOUNG: We had this marvelous old
serial set down in leather but it sort of rusted, so
one of the student assistance assignments was to take a
jar of grease up and to grease the serial set; right?
You guys ever do that? Yeah? It's amazing how they
come down. They look like they were, you know, full of
dust and rust and things like that. Those days are
gone.

Changing formats -- so how many of your
institutions has now continued to pack away this
microfiche? How many of you -- here's a question I
really like -- how many of you are government
documents, federal documents librarians, and that's the
name in your title? Six, seven, 12, whatever. How
many of you have federal documents as part of your
panoply of activity responsibilities? Many, many more.
So what is it to be a documents librarian? I know,
because I'm married to one. Or married --

characterized as a former documents librarian. And she

basically says, "It's your ability to both live with

diversity, but also to shift gears because you're doing

many, many different things that -- with many, many

different formats and many, many different activities."

And the most interesting thing to me is that documents

have always been serial material, and you get basically

the combination of serialists but also people that know

too much about the federal government and it's

organization in the combination of federal documents

librarians.

Flexibility, evolution also applies to land

grant universities, and we'll get into in a minute,

with Ag NICCA, The Agricultural Network Information

Committee Center Alliance. And adjusting to new

technology has been one of the big challenges there,

but also presenting terrific opportunities as I hope

you'll see in just a few minutes.

But under the leadership, the FDLP, GPO and

regionals coordinated this decentralized program as a

selective, but there's an essential role here also for

these people up here, because the Depository Library

Council is critical in providing the program leadership

and direction and advice to the public printer. And if

the public printer did not have that advice, where

would we all be -- out enjoying the afternoon; correct?

Land grant has state universities and USDA coordination, and we'll get into that in a few minutes. Now these 19th century partnerships are facing significant challenges.

And these challenges are a variety of different nature, but perhaps the most difficult one is to disambiguate whether it's economic changes that are driving the future or technological changes driving the future. Who would say that the economic changes are the primary ones driving change in our environments now? Raise hands? Economic changes, huh? One, two -- a very minority. How many people think technology is the driver? Okay, and the rest of you basically --

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: Both, yeah. I think it's both. I think it's both. It's really hard to say. But look at these things, global digital network infrastructure -- at least talk about, you know, the information superhighway. Whatever happened to that; right? And the NIH, whatever happened to that; right? And all these phrases that are kind of falling away, because we basically refer to this as the web; right? We used to say the Internet with a capital "I." Now it's small "I" and now the web; right? But it's really

fascinating to look at some of these studies of college-aged youth and ask them, you know, how intensively do you use the internet; right? And the responses are they don't. Why? Because it's so imbedded in terms of the way they multi-task. They don't think of it as something separate from they were; right -- in their continuous partial dependency.

You guys have children; right? Yeah? If you don't have one now, don't get one. That's my advice. They're very expensive.

I have one 24 and Timothy's going to be 20, you know, next month. These guys essentially aren't human. I mean they're from a different planet or something, you know.

They can do things with the radio on with about five things going. I go in, I can't do this. I have to back away from it. They're doing things, but they're not receiving things the way we are as categorization things. So they're doing things and it's a very strange thing, because my wife and I basically will say, "Well, Timothy, are you going to be home this evening for dinner?" He says, "I don't know." But -- what do you -- it depends; right? Because he's got a cell phone. Right? He's got a computer. Right? He's got wireless. Right? And he's

got friends. Right? And so if it's 8:00 o'clock at

night and Timothy doesn't have something going, then he

comes home; right? How often does that happen in a 19-

year-old? Do any of you guys have 19 or a 20-year-old?

It happens like once every month; right? But, you

know, it's sort of like saying, they play it

electronically, connected the terms, the way I would

never use a telephone like that. And they are used to

this. And it's a technology that they basically were

not born with, but came very quickly in terms of their

schooling, and they adapt to it. Well, you deal with

this all the time in terms of students.

When I talk to people that age, it's like I

have to think about what I'm saying so I can actually

understand what their reaction will be. When I talk to

librarians, it's an entirely different story. But are

you working with people at a younger age and do you

have problems in terms of crossing that barrier or that

age barrier to be able to talk to the -- well, we make

talk about things like web 2.0. We talk about the long

tail. We talk about YouTube, but we talk about it in

terms of "Oh, that's what Google bought;" right? But

they talk about their life and their face book and

their MySpace and their second life stuff. Do we do

that? Does anyone have an account on these things?

Oh, my God, you people are over the edge; right?

But you look at some of these things in terms

of social computing or social networking. And those

are the things that are really quite interesting,

because they're driving, shall we say, not only what

our kids are doing, but also what the news is and the

information cycles and everyone knows that what Google

did basically two days ago was they bought something

called double-click; right? And what this means

essentially is that advertisements now are integrated

with search; right? Fascinating. But what they did

was they paid twice for double click what they paid for

YouTube, 3.1 billion dollars. How would you like to be

able to pull out 3.1 billion dollars and lay it down

and to, shall we say, take your business in a different

direction?

How many of you live in communities where

Google is investing in putting in server farms. Right?

In Oregon, in North Carolina, it's absolutely

incredible. And these server farms are not simply oh,
well, they're just sort of 200 or 300 hundred machines,
they're thousands of machines their putting in there.
It's just incredible. They're transforming the nature
of what it is we think of as networking in a way that I
think would be very exciting, but also very confusing.
Because essentially there's a flavor to this age of
ambiguity, complexity and volatility and also for
someone as old as I am, there's an element of chaos.

　　　And I've thought about this but I just my
disclaimer earlier so I can really say this, the age of
chaos. I mean think of Don Imus and Paul Wolfowitz and
Attorney General Gonzales. These are people who last
month were in their position; right? And now they're
imploding. This is a really chaos -- the pace of
change is fascinatingly short in terms of the, shall we
say, the markers, the milestones by which we gauge
these things.

　　　But this face of change seems faster to us.
I don't know what it seems like for millennium
generation. My sense is they're not bothered by it,
because they haven't basically seen or lived through
times in which they're a slow pace and sequential
changes both in the news, as well as in individual
life.

So let's explore some of the impact of these changes, change forces, on the FDLP. I skipped through standards and policy changes, but you guys could know about that, because we read that economics and technology are actually driving these change of activities.

So these change forces -- and obviously we're extremely familiar with it in terms of e-only federal agency publications. And, you know, part of the President's management agenda is to move to e-government environment. You're all aware of that? You file away these things fairly carefully, but it's really dominating. When I got to USDA in 2002, there was an e-government initiative that was essentially sweeping through as a result of that e-government initiative a whole wad of changes have been happening in the USDA. And the USDA of 1862 is one of the oldest federal agencies. And age is a determinate of how slowly you basically change. But I view it as a marvelous thing, because essentially it gave me an excuse to say, "We need to take our 64,000 web pages at NAL and actually reposition those and bring them over into a mandatory guidelines format." So you see federal agencies' websites change as a result of this initiative. I think, haven't you? You go there

everyday; right?

What I haven't seen change, however, is the US Congress's website. Does anyone know about that?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: Some of these things are really [indecipherable].

So you guys covered a lot of these subjects at the fall 2005 Depository Library Council meeting, and with Judy's vision and brainstorming, and I didn't have a chance to celebrate Judy's departure from GPO, but I did have the honor of actually serving as a reference for her at the University of Florida. As I understand, she's taken over as dean there in early May. God bless her. I think she's going to do a marvelous job there.

But essentially the visionary session back in 2005 in the fall identified the opportunities and challenges posed by today's rich information environment. It's all in this knowledge will forever govern document. Right? You memorialized this; right? And it's part of your action agenda planning; correct?

And you know that if I mention these 17 things, -- customer focus, managing collections and delivering content, deploying expertise, education, increasing flexibility, adding value, promotion and

marketing collaboration, innovation in advocacy -- you
can identify and resonate with those topics, because
they came from the community through brainstorming;
correct?

So what about the impact of these change
forces on the federal land grant university system for
which you guys are well represented? How much do you
know about agriculture?

COUNCIL MEMBER: It's part of our daily
lives.

PETER YOUNG: I mean you do it three times a
day; right? Some of us more if you drink rude
substances. I was going to say -- I was going to riff
on your University of Colorado [inaudible]. Here in
Colorado, we drink Coors; right? There's a University
of Colorado cheer for that; right?

So declining domestic dependence on U.S.
agriculture, six million farms produced the nation's
food supply during World War II. Why is that
important? Because 90 percent of all farm output today
comes from fewer than one million farms. In 60 sixty
years, we've gone from six million to one million farms
producing.

In 1900, 41 percent of the work force of the
entire country was employed in agricultural activity.

Anybody want to guess what it is today?

COUNCIL MEMBER: Less than two percent.

PETER YOUNG: Less than two percent, 1.9 percent.

So in Lincoln's era, what was the percentage of the population that was doing farm work? 70 percent of the population in Lincoln's era in the 1860's. Agriculture, as a [indecipherable] of gross domestic product in 1930, 7.7 percent; today, .7 percent. There were a lot of changes in terms of the -- there was a reputation for the definition for agriculture in America. And these changes essentially have proposed some changes to the federal system with regard to land grant universities.

So if mention something called CREATE-21, does anyone here know what that is?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: No. It's a proposal. CREATE stands for creating research extension and teaching excellence for the 21st century. It's what -- NASLGUC [phonetic] -- does anyone no creates know what NASLGUC is? Come on, guys. National Association of State Land Grant University Colleges; right? It is, shall we say, the ARL equivalent for land grant universities. And how many universities in the United States are land

grant universities? 214. You get the 1862's, the 1890's, you get the 1964's and you get the 1994's, the Hispanic serving institutions, the private colleges. This is a public higher education system for this country for which a lot of us are graduates. But CREATE-21 is the proposal from NASLGUC's award on agricultural assembly, to change the nature of the organization by which the land grant system interfaces with USDA. And it comes as a result of, shall we say, static funding for research, education and teaching at land grant universities over the past 60 years.

But also it is counter to another proposal, the NIFA, the NIFA, the National Institute for Food and Agriculture which was proposed and it was introduced by the last session of Congress, and it was really supported by former Senator Danforth from Missouri.

Anyone from the University of Missouri or Missouri? You know Senator Danforth?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: Of course, exactly. He has proposed basically that what's necessary for agricultural is that we create an institute for agriculture, for food and agriculture, a national one. And would make independent of USDA.

It would be basically following the NIH

example, because NIH has been very successful in the
past five years at doubling -- doubling it's
appropriation. So how much money does NIH get now from
the federal government -- 29 billion dollars last year;
29 billion dollars this year. How much money goes into
ag research nationally -- two billion dollars.

How much money for Department of Energy
research last year? Well, --

COUNCIL MEMBER: Just under nine.

PETER YOUNG: Just under nine million.

COUNCIL MEMBER: Billion.

PETER YOUNG: Nine billion, sorry.

COUNCIL MEMBER: A billion here, a million
there.

PETER YOUNG: How much many money
[indecipherable] a year? This year is 8.2 million
dollars -- billion dollars. So the idea here is that
there isn't enough investment in agriculture in terms
of research, education and teaching and land grant
universities basically are moving towards the
privatization of public higher education. Have you
heard that phrase in land grant universities? What it
means basically is that public universities are
basically dependent more on private investment sources
than they are on public investment. And the public

investment from the federal sector is a declining

percentage in a lot of these institutions.

So a lot of proposals for change. The one I

want to focus on just for a minute before I glaze you

guys' eyes over is one that's proposed in the farm

bill. You guys know every federal agency like the

Department of Agriculture is re-authorized every five

years. Why five years? Who knows. But the next one

coming up is 2005. And in the Farm Bill, Title 7, if

you look it up, essentially the Department of

Agriculture has proposed to Congress that there be some

rearrangement of research investments for USDA.

I'm going to break here.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: The idea here is that the Farm

Bill, Title 7, research proposal, is to take two

different units inside USDA, the ag research service

which has a billion dollars worth of internal research,

intramural research, and CSREES with a cooperative

state research, education -- excuse me, the cooperative

state research, education and extension service that

join these two together.

Does that sound like federal bureaucracy at

its highest? And what are they trying to do as a

result of these things? What's their goal?

                    AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

                    PETER YOUNG: I can't hear you.

                    AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

                    PETER YOUNG: More money, exactly, exactly.
The balance shall we say of the research investment.

          But let's look at the forces of change in
terms of past and future, or shall we say the past
versus future. Are change forces in danger of
unbalancing previously successful partnerships and are
we -- to quote what is it Gladwell -- at a tipping here
but to the elements of the partnership that we
memorized earlier this afternoon, the six points,
really still hold. And if they still do hold, how do
we reposition ourselves for future success and
relevancy to FDLP, as well as to the land grant
university system? And how can these successful
partnerships be rebalanced? This rebalancing
essentially means the partnerships must revolve in
response to the forces of change. And then elements of
successful partnerships can hold if there is once again
leadership and flexibility, the last of the two
elements.

          So let's look at several ways that the
National Agricultural Library has been responding to
change over the last five years?

How are we doing on time? Are we getting to the bewitching hour yet?

COUNCIL MEMBER: [inaudible] Almost.

PETER YOUNG: Almost?

COUNCIL MEMBER: You have 22 minutes.

PETER YOUNG: I have 22 minutes left? You guys want to stand up, stretch, would be good? You're looking a little grim out there. Maybe it's the lighting of the room.

Let's just --

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: -- excuse me?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

PETER YOUNG: Yeah, the lost farms? What's happened is the farms declined from six million down to one million, but they've also gotten bigger. But the number of people in agriculture or small farms -- that is 200 acres and below -- are increasing. But it's not a full time activity. So if you create or you generate a thousand dollars a year off your farm, you're a commercial farmer in this country and entitled to subsidies; right? Because the U.S. Department of Agriculture whose budget is over 82 billion dollars a year uses 62 billion dollars for something we like to characterize as subsidies. Right? And I worked for an

undersecretary a few years ago that basically said,
"What you need to do is take the investment of
subsidies and transfer it into research." Now you're
talking about some real programmatic progress in terms
of agricultural science.

What NAL basically is is a bifurcated
library. We serve the Department of Agriculture, but
we also serve the nation. And, you know, there are
five different national libraries? Do you all know
these things? I don't to go into who is and who isn't;
right? Thank you. We'll skip that.

In addition to these NAL, three NAL
partnerships, I have to mention that NAL recently,
after a year and a half worth of consultation and navel
gazing has rescoped our flagship index Agripava
[phonetic]. Do you know Agripava [phonetic]? Agripava
is about a 30-year-old index. We started out in 1970
to say we're going to cover comprehensibly the index
literature of agriculture. And we started out by
indexing about 17,000 journals partial and full, and we
were down by the time I got to NAL in 2002 to indexing
partial and full 850 [inaudible].

Unlike medicine, we have not kept up with the
times. But unlike medicine we have, shall we say, a
commercial alternative to that in terms of bio-sys

[phonetic] as well as CAP , as well as other sources.
And I being shall we say a person that's somewhat
familiar with the private sector and the flavor from
which competition from federal government comes,
decided we were going to back off and we were really
going to focus on re-scoping the curricula into
covering USDA publications, because NAL has not
included comprehensively the USDA publications, both
in terms of those items resulting from USDA activity
internally, that is official publications, but also
those USDA publications resulting from federal
investment and scientific publishing. So more of that
in a moment.

Essentially rescoping the 30-year-old index
of ag literature is intended to enhance public access
to the products of federal investment in terms of USDA
publications.

So I want to talk a bit about AG-NIC, which
is the Agricultural Networking Information Center. How
many of your institutions do you know are members of AG-
NIC? A few. There are 59 total in this collaborative
partnership between NAL and the land grant university
system. It's been 12 years now since it's origin. By
providing information topics reflecting institutional
specialization and expertise, AG-NIC partner

institutions provide public access to resources and tools of interest to the broader community served by agriculture in the country.

Say for example, Purdue has a water quality resources within the AG-NIC environment. University of Minnesota focuses on forestry. University of Tennessee focuses on pet health. This is the left site for AG-NIC off of NAL site. Washington State University focuses on tree fruit; University of Wisconsin, cranberries.

Ohio State University has a site that really focuses on something extremely important today of bees and pollination. How many of you know about colony about the colony collapse? People think it's about honey. Friends, it's not about honey. It's about pollination of crops for food for this country and for the world. And the bees disappear before it's really a strange phenomena, because some of the people at the USDA have been looking into this. It's not something that scientists understand completely now. What's odd about this is that the bees basically don't die and you don't find their bodies by the colonies, but they get disoriented. It's almost as if they've got Alzheimer's, and they can't find their way back to the hive. If bees essentially are not made health in this

country, we stand to suffer very significant decrease in terms of both food stuffs, but also the prices of these things, as well as worldwide trade.

Michigan State University focuses interestingly enough on asparagus, blueberries, cherries and maple sugar. And University of Wisconsin for some reason focuses on cranberries.

But AG-NIC essentially represents NAL involvement in the land grant university system that has evolved and changed in response to the changes in technology, and the change in demand for access to agricultural information. And essentially the AG-NIC alliance has been the primary dialog group with which NAL has been talking about ag space or digital repository. And just within the past several months, NAL has launched and is about to make public a d-space expository in IR that we've magically called ag-space. And we intend really to load scientific articles authored by the USDA researchers that have resulted from intramural research initially. We've got about 100.

The way we found those articles essentially is by looking in Scopus [phonetic] and being able to identify the most cited ag articles authored by USDA/ARS researchers. And I think the top one was

about 4,000 sites, or 4,000 citations to it, and it had

something to do with I think genetics of cotton. But

those are the presumable highly cited and presumably

the most in demand items.

But essentially we're riffing on the National

Library of Medicine's NIH [inaudible] central

initiative a year and a half ago, but we're doing it

not with extra-morally funded products, but rather by

intramural products produced by ARS researchers.

We plan to include materials in the field of

agriculture, food and natural resources and links from

Agriplar [phonetic] also plan for ag-space and we plan

to launch that pretty soon.

And ag-space is really designed to complement

NAL's work in developing what we're [indecipherable]

really for the past six years as the National Digital

Library for Agriculture. This NDLA is currently in our

shop, the design concept site. It's envisioned to

provide easy access to authoritative information data

and services for the public and the scientific research

community as well as the education community.

And we've been consulting with a wide array

of partners, both AG-NIC, as well as the U.S. Ag

Information Network or USAIN, as well as with our

colleagues at NASLGUC and the food and agriculture

organization of the United Nations about NDLA over the past five years.

And frankly the library -- the folks at NAL are very excited about the prospects of developing a partnership system that takes advantage of new opportunities with distributed knowledge technologies. Just as recently as the week before last, we were really focusing on NDLA with 1890 institutions, that is those historically black universities around the country that really have not had the resources and infrastructure to develop the support necessary for agricultural technology.

The NDLA's vision is a component of the national digital data framework that is needed to capitalize on the production and re-purposing of digital data.

To use the massive data sets resulting from scientific research effectively, the NDLA must address concerns about stewardship, duration and long-term access.

So, okay, guys, how many of your institutions have [indecipherable] archives? And how many of those institutional archives have agricultural material in them now? And who is going to coordinate what goes into these things so we're not, shall we say,

duplicating them? And so we're hoping AG-NIK basically

is going to help us parse through some of these issues.

And it's not simply about the extensive publications

and experiment publications from the states, but it's

also about the data resulting from the work in genetics

and gnomic research resulting from the molecular

biology as related to ag-times, but also from remote

sensing and climate change activity during

environmental modeling, and even for trying to

understand the relationship between food, nutrition and

obesity, because some would say that there's an

obesity, childhood obesity pandemic that's occurring

throughout the country.

But once again I'm getting away from our

topic about NDLA and the change -- excuse me, FDLP. So

you've got me doing NDLA and FDLP. Some of these

acronyms have to, shall we say, distance themselves

from one other.

So this presentation really is concluding

with the idea that there is a time for change, and the

reason there was a time for change is partly that there

are more [indecipherable] publications, but there are

few tangible receipts. And one of the real problems we

have I think that these and others have struggled in

the field about is how do you measure the benefits of

these investments? How does it -- how do libraries in

terms of performance overall measure success and

failure? And it's a very difficult both economic as

well as performance measure challenge to be able to

identify what it is to deans and directors, as well as

provosts, presidents, vice presidents, much less the

trustees -- why land grant universities need to

continue to be members of the Federal Depository

Library System.

The lack of perpetual access to increase the

e-government publications and you guys know any of the

archive and Brewster Kale? He's capturing a lot of

this stuff in terms of the way-back machine. But the

difficulty is that he's capturing it at a fairly low

level rather than a deep level.

So if you look at some of these federal

sites, some of this information that was there last

month, last year, last 10 years is no longer present.

So the Library of Congress and others are capturing

things at election time, but there's a whole lot that's

disappearing in terms of the federal record here. Not

in terms of things that are published but rather things

that are made available electronically.

NAL's relationships with USDA agencies, and

they're 29 agencies within USDA, provide an efficient

source for publications. And we really turn to the
department for these activities in capturing these
things rather than depending upon NAL's status as a
depository selected [inaudible].

One last review of how we got here. Remember
the six elements of partnerships, and we're getting
close to the end, friends, so you can relax. There's
that balance again with the six different elements. So
how can FDLP achieve the vision expressed in knowledge
will forever govern, the seven goals included in the
vision statement for Federal Depository Libraries in
the 21st century will have to generate action plans,
that we talked about earlier this afternoon, that
reflect these six essential elements. But most
critically, the transformed FDLP will have to build in
the last two elements to be flexible and evolving and
to be equipped with leadership needed to be a reliable
source.

But here's the point, and it's very small.
If this is my one slide that you guys can't read;
right? So shall I read it to you in the back? Yes?
No? I'm not hearing an overwhelming call to read it to
you in the back.

I'll just mention that essentially I want to
focus on flexibility and evolving evolution that is

remaining flexible and responsive to change in
information and environment needs and our customer's
needs as those needs change, and to decrease the focus
on distribution, storage and description.

And leadership is necessary in order to
reposition the FDLP as the reliable source for public
information. Authentication and de-politicalization of
issues is critical. Evaluation and interpretation of
resources and the integration of services which are I
think your program is chock full of these topics, as
well as the customary packaging for special groups and
needs and to educate the public.

So it's no secret that librarians are largely
invisible to a lot of partners, because when I started
in my librarianship, the instructions were not to wear
your name tag, not to give our your name and not to
read the names of the books that you're signing out to
the individual patron. This is a matter of personal
privacy to them.

But it's also true that customers today in
our world are increasingly responding to personalized
design and customized services. Perhaps we, as
librarians, as federal documents librarians, need to be
personally more visible in the web-based services that
we provide and that we stand behind rather than remain

as anonymous sources. Perhaps we need to make personal

and public recommendations of sources, to be proactive

and expose our expertise, and this hopefully would give

added value to the information that we provide to our

customers and to the nation.

So, remember these two questions we started

out with? What's the role of FDLP in a global age of

global digital network? What would be consequences of

the FDLP going out of existence? Well, perhaps the

answer involved moving from a passive to a more

proactive, an active engaged role for FDLP providing a

customer interface to federal public information.

So, documents librarian professionals are

uniquely positioned to help rethink our role and to

reposition our services to gain an added relevance and

value to our nation's citizens. The FDLP partnership

can evolve to become a more equally collaborative

network balancing that need in terms of the elements.

The future will see a shift in depository

material toward access to public information in a much

more proactive way. And American frankly needs the

FDLP to provide a mutual trusted source in our

politicized information environment of today, but we

have to recognize that achieving the knowledge will

forever govern vision, means that we will have to

evolve and change or some would say pass away into
irrelevance.

So to quote Carl Sagan "The challenge is to
evolve or to die." And I thought for a few minutes
about ending on shall we say this challenging rather
negative note, so let me just share with you a quote
from Thomas L. Freedman's article entitled "The Power
of Green" in today's New York Times magazine section.
He says that one day in the not too distant future,
"America will need and want to get its groove back. We
will need to find a way to re-knit America at home, to
reconnect America abroad and to restore America to its
natural place in the global order as a beacon of
progress, hope and inspiration." I think that there is
no more noble way to do this than to insure that the
American public has access to its government
information from the FDLP system.

Thank you very much for your kind attention
this afternoon, and it was great to see you all.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Thank you very much. I
think we only have time for a couple of questions, and
does council have any? Mark?

MARK SANDLER: I have just one. Peter, your
second point in your keeping this balance that's
fundamental to the successful partnerships was shared

values and trust. And you've worked in the federal

government in one place or another for a long time.

And I guess I wondering whether you think that there

are either moments in history or administrations that

are better or worse at relating to academic partners,

the academic community as a partner?

PETER YOUNG: I think that's a question that

David McPherson, President of NASLGUC has really

responded to in the past, because he essentially is the

person who headed the whole range of different

international offices of the federal government. And

he basically has identified that what's necessary is

that we move beyond partisan politics into an

environment in which we've really become reconnected

with the world. And I suppose that the age

internationalism in the last -- in my experience, 27

years in federal government, would really have to be an

age in which the depository and university system

really has been given more attention and more support.

But my sense is that I remember many years ago those

things that Eileen Cook of the [inaudible] Washington

office talked about the difference between servicing a

Republican administration for Nixon and a Democratic

administration for Johnson, and she said, "You know, we

fared well in both in terms of support for the library.

And so I think perhaps there's an element here of we need to make our own opportunities with whichever brand of administration or politics are in order. And my sense is that the -- I have relatives in China. I am focusing a lot of attention on the relationship between the U.S. and China, because that's part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's initiatives.

And a lot of what I think Thomas L. Freedman's written about about the flat earth is really becoming something that forces us into an environment that says we have to compete not among ourselves in terms of partisan politics, but as our national perspective begins to be challenged not simply militarily or in terms of ideology but economically in the world, and if you'd like, intellectually in the world, we need to turn our attention toward how it is those higher level things need to be motivating our political leaders so that the pattern can be broken, and so that the relationship between the federal government and academia, especially public higher education, can be supported and improved in the future.

I hope I didn't dodge it too much.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Anybody else on council?

I really think that's all the time we have.

I do have a couple of announcements and also a reminder
again that there's coffee with council at 8:00 o'clock
tomorrow morning in the lobby.

We will start our session at 8:30 tomorrow.
I have been given a couple of announcements. One,
state library agency discussion forum will be led by
Richard Akeroyd on Tuesday, 5:00 o'clock in the Aspen
Room, and then also law librarians and friends, dinner
at Ship Tavern tonight. Sign up is on the message
board. You meet in the Tower Lobby at 5:45 p.m.
tonight. And you need to see Scott Matheson for
information. So, and he's got his hand up.

Again, Peter, thank you very much for the
presentation and see you all tomorrow morning.

(The session concluded at 4:58 p.m.)

STATE OF COLORADO   )

) ss.   CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF DENVER   )

        I, Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter and
Notary Public within and for the State of Colorado,
certify that the foregoing is a correct transcription
from the digital recording of the proceedings in the
above-entitled matter.

    I further certify that I am neither counsel
for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties
to the action in which this hearing was taken, and
further that I am not financially or otherwise
interested in the outcome of the action.

        In witness whereof, I have affixed my
 signature and seal this 30th day of April, 2007.

 My commission expires August 16, 2010.

 _____

    Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE

APRIL 16, 2007

_____

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: I hope everybody's ready

for a full day. I also hope that everybody did have a

chance to get outside last night and enjoy the

beautiful weather at least during the evening. And as

folks have told me, the weather is going to change and

it's going to change again. And this is Denver and

it'll change quicker than most places.

Welcome back this morning. We're going to

have, as I said, a whole day today. We have GPO

update. We get to hear from the acting public printer.

And just a reminder, if there are any announcements

that I need to make, just make sure you get them to me

before we start the session. We will have a break in

the morning. Also a reminder that lunch selectives

and regionals this is your day unless you had a

conflict that you could have lunch together, and I hope

that you all have made plans and gotten together on

that.

For those of you who are interested in having

access to the Wi-Fi that's in this room, the pass code

is on the bulletin board. Lance didn't give it to me

because I looked at it. I don't think I could repeat

it enough times, and that would take a few minutes
anyway. It's a very long pass code. It is case
sensitive. Just little case, small letter. Don't caps
-- no caps. But it is a long code. It's back there on
the bulletin board, and that will give you access the
Wi-Fi.

Also I want to give you reminder tonight
about the conference reception at the Colorado History
Museum. It's from 6:00 to 9:00 p.m., and just as a
precaution, you should take your badges with you. That
way they know that you are associated with this
conference and should be there for the reception, so
make sure you take your badges with you. Okay.

Yes, Ann?

ANN MILLER: As the wireless expert now, once
you've done it, you're in. So I logged in yesterday
and I didn't have to log in today. So you only need to
remember this once.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Anything else from council?
Any other -- okay.

Well, I have the pleasure this morning of
introducing Bill Turri, deputy public printer and chief
operating officer. And since Bruce James's retirement
in December, Mr. Turri has been acting -- has been
serving as acting public printer.

Mr. Turri is a 1962 graduate of the Rochester Institute of Technology, the School of Graphic Arts and Photography.

Mr. Turri joined Case Hoyt in 1963 and rose to be vice president for sales. In 1985 he was named chief operating officer of Monroe-Lippo. Mr. Turri served as president of Monroe-Lippo from 1993 to 1995. He then returned to Case Hoyt to be president and member of board of directors until his retirement in 2001.

Bill Turri is a member of RIT's president's roundtable and Nathaniel Rochester Society, which is an organization dedicated to providing scholarships for RIT students. He was a 2002 recipient of RIT's outstanding alumni award. He has established an endowed scholarship to fund RIT student scholarships.

He has lectured at senior classes at RIT, and he's also served on the New York State Board of Printing Industries of America, and he is a member of the Printing School Industry Advisory Committee.

Please welcome the acting public printer.

WILLIAM TURRI: Good morning and thank you. I appreciate you inviting me here today.

They told me about a month ago that I had to come out here and do this and, of course, when Bruce

hired me, it was his job to go out and do stuff like

this, and my job was to stay back at the plant, be

operation and take care of the day-to-day program. So,

Ric said, "Well, you've got to come out there and tell

them what's going on at the GPO." So, I'm here with

all my pieces of paper in front of me to tell you about

what's going on at the GPO. So, sit back and relax and

I'll try to update you on everything I can.

I've been serving in the GPO since 2003. The

former public printer, Bruce James, appointed me as

deputy public printer. My primary responsibility, as I

said, was to manage GPO's day-to-day operations. That

included the functions of the FDLP.

With Bruce's departure this past January, I

became the acting public printer. I will continue to

service in this capacity until a new public printer is

appointed following confirmation by the Senate.

Although I know the White House is searching

for a suitable candidate, to this date there has been

no announcement of intention to nominate anyone, and I

am not candidate for that nomination.

The staff we have assembled is largely still

in place, so I'm getting plenty of help in running the

GPO.

As you know, Judy Russell ended her duties as

Superintendent of Documents at the end of February, and
we appreciate the outstanding job that Judy did.

My view is that it's appropriate for the next
superintendent to be appointed by the next public
printer. I've named Ric Davis, whom all of you know,
as acting superintendent. Ric is an outstanding
manager with a depth of experience in the document
material, especially electronic dissemination. I have
full confidence in his abilities to carry out the FDLP
and other documents program.

Like Bruce, I strongly support the long-
standing partnership between the GPO and the depository
library community. This partnership is the keystone
for providing comprehensive and equitable public access
to government information.

GPO's foundations and its future lie in
working with the library community to make government
information available to the public in the forums and
formats most useful to the people the library serves.
Working with the libraries, GPO has a strong record of
achievement and commitment, and I expect to see that
record continue.

What I'd like to do this morning is review
for you where we are today and what's going on with our
budget request that's currently pending before

Congress, which contains a number of items of interest to the depository community.

I'd also like to go over the status of our Oversight Committee, the Joint Committee on Printing, and other issues of interest.

I hope you have seen our annual report for 2006. In it we reported that our six new business lines are in place, as described in our strategic vision for the 21st century -- security and intelligence documents, digital media services, customer services, library services and content management, publication and information sales and official journals of government.

We reported that over the past four years, GPO has become a more efficient organization. Our organizational structure has been streamlined for faster decision making. We have implemented enterprise-wide planning for our information technology systems, and redundant facilities across the county have been consolidated or closed.

Most importantly, our finances have been restored to a positive basis reversing a pattern of financial losses resulting from operational losses, as well as the adjustments that GPO's long-term liability for Federal Workers Compensation in previous years.

For the year, we reported a net income of 9.8 million from operations, compared with 6.1 million the year before. This is the third straight year of positive financial results for the GPO.

Restoring our finances was achieved principally through three early retirement incentive programs in 2003, 2004 and 2005, using authority provided through various Legislative Branch Appropriation Acts. These programs reduced the [indecipherable] of the GPO by more than 600 positions for an annual savings of approximately 40 million. Using those savings, we were able to carry out necessary investments in technology and services and reshape our workforce to provide the skills and ability the GPO needs today and in coming years.

I'd like to thank all of you in the depository community who have worked with us to help achieve those significant results.

The change in political leadership in both the houses of Congress has led to major changes in personnel who oversee and work with the GPO on Capitol Hill. This is perhaps the first time in GPO's history where with very few exceptions, most of the primary congressional leadership positions affecting the GPO are held by women starting with the Speaker of the

House, Nancy Pelosi. We have Representative Bonita Millender McDonald from California as chairwoman of the House Administration Committee. Representative Debbie Wasserman Schultz from Florida is chair of the newly reconstituted House Legislative Branch Appropriations subcommittee and Lorraine Miller as clerk of the House of Representatives.

Over on the Senate side, we have Senator Diane Feinstein from California as chairwoman of the Rules of Administration Committee, Senator Mary Landrell of Louisiana as chair of the Senate subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, and Nancy Erickson as secretary of the Senate.

We are looking forward to working with all of them, and to date, I have either met with or appeared before a number of them.

Both the House and the Senate have named their members to the Joint Committee on Printing. These include Senators Feinstein, Inouye of Hawaii, Murray of Washington, Bennett of Utah and Chambliss of Georgia.

From the House, Representatives Millender-McDonald, Brady of Pennsylvania and Capuano from Massachusetts, Ellers from Michigan and McCarthy from California.

The JCP is planning an organizational meeting for this week to elect a chairman and a vice chairman, adopt committee rules and approve a pending GPO wage contract.

In the 110th Congress, the leadership of the JCP will be on the House side. Some of the staff of the House Administration Committee in a set of rules of the Administration Committee have worked with JCP issues in the past and will continue to be on hand for the 110th Congress. This then put Mike Harrison and Brian Dorsey on the House Administration Committee and Matt McGowan on the set of Rules of the Administration Committee.

While it's still early in the 110th Congress, it is clear that issues involving improving public access to congressional and other government information, whether it's part of lottery reform measures to expand the use of online information or for other reasons are getting increased attention. We are hopeful that this will translate into increased support for a number of our initiatives, including our future digital system, electronic projects for the depository program and technology improvements or information production system.

Whether that support translates into dollars

remains to be seen. From our standpoint, the overall budget outlook, at least for the legislative branch, is very tight. GPO, along with the rest of the government, is operating under a continuing resolution for 2007. It essentially flat funds us at 2006 levels, with an incremental increase for mandatory wage and salary costs, plus the retraining fund.

As a result, we now have a large gap to cover as we try to restore our funding levels to the levels we will need for 2008. With other agencies competing for the same dollars and in a budget environment of the range of other costly national priorities, it's going to be an uphill climb to close that gap.

This makes us appreciate even more the support we've already gotten from the library community for our requests. Dry mountain air.

For 2008, we've submitted a sizable budget package, about 182 million, representing an increase of nearly 50 percent from our current level of funding. Our current level of funding is 122 million.

This is the way our request breaks down. For congressional printing and binding, we're asking for 109.5 million, up from 87 million this year, primarily to recover a projected shortfall of several million dollars this year under the current continuing

resolution and to pay for essential publications like the new edition of the U.S. Code and other products Congress has projected to order.

For the salaries and expenses appropriation of the superintendent of documents, we're requesting 45.6 million, up from the current level of about 33 million. That's to cover mandatory pay increases and pay for upcoming projects, including the distribution of the U.S. Code, as well as electronic projects to expand public access.

Of the total request, 33 million is for the depository program. 11 million is for cataloging and indexing, and the rest is for international exchange and statutory distribution.

The money we're seeking for documents is a big increase, 12.5 million or nearly 40 percent. Of that amount, we've included 7.4 million for new projects and initiatives, many of which will benefit the depository library program, including data migration and processing new digitized and harvested content for excess, FDLP outreach and assessments, expanding, cataloging and indexing for web harvesting, data storage, capital expenses associated with authentication, modernization of our tangible products distribution systems, as well as our international

exchange program and CD-Rom data migration.

Many of these projects are actually the same
as we presented last year when they won approval from
the Senate appropriations subcommittee. Regrettably,
that approval didn't last as the original fiscal year
of 2007 bill was replaced with a continuing resolution
we're now operating under.

The rest of the overall appropriations
increase we're seeking is for a revolving fund. We're
requesting about 27 million. Of that 27 million, 10.5
million is to complete our future digital system
project, which the library community has been so
supportive of. We've already spent about two-thirds of
the system development costs and release of the system
will be ready to go public later this year.

The money we're seeking in our request is for
releases two and three, which are enhancements to the
system that Mike Wash will be discussing later today.

The rest of our revolving fund requests were
various IT projects, including funds to being replacing
our automated composition system and provide for a web
content manager, continue with or oracle enterprise
project and carry on a variety of IT needs supporting
our agency infrastructure.

We're also seeking funds for various needed

building repairs, including a new roof and to complete
workforce retraining.

As you may know, one of our workforce
training projects over the past year was a pilot
demonstration of digitizing legacy content. We're
going to be discussing the result of that project with
the JCP and seeking a continuation of legacy
digitization to support improved public access to
government information.

Okay, I guess there has been some interest in
our new building, so let me give you an update on where
we are with the new building project.

We've been keeping you informed on the status
of our plan for a new building. This plan essentially
involved moving out of the current structure on North
Capitol Street in Washington, relocating to a smaller,
more efficient and better designed and equipped
facility in the D.C. area and leasing out the current
structure for development.

We envisioned using the proceeds of that
lease to fund the new facility and contribute to GPO's
revolving fund where it could help offset the increases
in future appropriations. We drafted legislation to
accomplish this plan since it would be necessary to
authorize GPO to dispose of the current facilities and

retain the development proceeds, and we fully briefed
our authoring appropriations committee on our plan.

Unfortunately, the congressional budget
office is not enthusiastic about this kind of real
estate transaction for a federal building. It's known
as third party financing. And under the congressional
budget office's scoring rules, the resulting score was
significant. By that, I mean it was so expensive,
around 320 million, that it essentially ended the
legislative prospects for this plan. However, there
remained significant interest in determining the future
of our building in our appropriations and oversight
committees, and there are conceivably other building
options we could take. We plan to present the
situation to the incoming joint committee on printing
and seek guidance and a direction we should now take.

Another very major thing that's going on at
the GPO is the new passport situation. We've been -- I
think we've been keeping you informed on our passport
production efforts. As you know, today we're in an
environment that requires incorporating computer chips
into the new generation of passports. Public demand
for passports is skyrocketing because the documents are
now required for North American/Caribbean travel. The
state department is issuing 44 percent more passports

this year compared to last. And a week ago reported
issuing more than 400,000 passports in just one week.

As you can imagine, this demand is affecting
GPO. Not too long ago, GPO produced in the
neighborhood of eight million blank passports annually.
Last month, we produced more than 1.1 million of the
new electronic passports. And this month we're being
asked to provide a target of 1.2 million, while
continuing to produce the legacy non-electronic
passport version.

At the current rate they are being issued by
state, annual production levels at GPO may have to
climb to 20 million and beyond. To accomplish this
feat, we have assigned more staff, expanded production
shifts and are acquiring more equipment. Passports
once a simple blank book product of GPO operations are
rapidly becoming one of GPO's largest products in terms
of production volume, costs and revenue.

Okay, we've been reporting to you also on our
performance measurement efforts. These stem from an
interest expressed to us a couple of years ago by the
former chairman of the state -- of the Senate
legislative branch appropriations subcommittee, Senator
Elliott, in the Use of Government Performance and
Results Act to measure GPO operations and outcome.

Although GPO is not covered by the act which applies
only to the executive branch, we pledged the time to
review it for opportunities to set up comparable
performance management systems for our functions.
Where the depository library program is concerned,
Ric's group has developed the following initiatives and
will be working on indicators to measure progress --
first, implement training modules to expand training
coverage for the Federal Depository Library Program;
second, expand content and service partnerships with
the federal depository libraries; and third, expand
collaboration and research for federal depository
libraries.   Ric and his staff will be discussing these
initiatives during the conference.

Authentication: There are some developments
of note in regard to GPO's authentication initiative.
As most of you know, the primary objective of GPO's
authentication initiative is to assure users that the
electronic information made available by GPO to the
FDLP is authentic. GPO's authentication initiative
will allow users to determine that the files we make
available are unchanged once GPO has authenticated
them. I'm pleased to say that we plan a beta-test of
an authenticated GPO access application in May. And
where we are right now technologically is a precursor

to a more advanced offering that may be made available through the future digital system. Again, Ric and Mike will be touching on the specific details with you later.

I also know that many of you library community feel that the Title 44 needs some changes, and we certainly agree that there are -- there are some things on Title 44 that need to be updated. However, my sense is that we need to wait until the new JCP is formed and discuss our proposals with them at that time.

I thank you and this concludes the information that I wanted to share with you today.

RIC DAVIS: Good morning everyone. I'm pleased to join Bill Turri, Bill Sudduth and the Depository Library Council in welcoming you to Denver for the spring Depository Library Council meeting.

Lance and I do apologize in advance that we did not put up on the website to pack shorts to come to this event, because if you're like me, part of your bag was taken up by a huge winter coat that is now going to storage.

I'm very happy that so many of you were able to join us here. There are over 200 people registered for this meeting. As always, and knowing that many of

our colleagues aren't able to be with us today, I want to encourage you to share all of the information gathered at the conference with those in your institution and your community.

The GPO update will be posted on the FDLP Desktop as well as other presentations you will see, and we are also recording sessions to make them available as pod casts.

I welcome and value your feedback and your viewpoints, and I will be accessible throughout this conference. I also want to encourage all of you to attend the council session open forum tomorrow afternoon in which there will be a Q&A session available with the council and GPO staff.

As Bill mentioned, on March 1st I began serving as acting superintendent of documents in addition to my permanent position at GPO as director of the library services and content management business unit. I will continue to serve in this acting capacity as superintendent until a permanent replacement is named. I am confident that the Federal Depository Library Program can only strengthen as we work together to fulfill our shared mission of keeping America informed.

Both the GPO staff and I look forward to

continuing our efforts with you to modernize and
improve permanent public access to government
information. I also want to emphasize that GPO's
commitment to provide the public with no fee access
government information through the FDLP, including GPO
access, remains the same. GPO will not allow access to
items available through GPO access to be restricted or
diminished. The public will be able to print and
download this information without restriction.

        The theme of this conference is partnerships.
Many of the activities that we are now engaged in at
GPO and the sessions you will be able to attend at this
conference focus on this theme of partnerships.

        I want to talk a little bit today about the
partnership activities and measurements related to the
Government Performance Results Act that Bill mentioned
and the FDLP.

        Following this, I want to give you updates on
specific projects that are not mentioned in your
handouts. These include authentication, harvesting,
legacy digitization, the catalog of government
publications. The FDLP Desktop, Purls, Ask GPO,
assessments, metrics and our NTIS and Pacer
relationship. That sounds like a lengthy list, but I
promise it'll go fairly quickly. It's just very

important, and I want to fill you in on all of that.
You'll also be hearing more details from our staff
during the conference as well.

First, let's talk about GIPRA [phonetic],
including Opal and partnerships. Tying back to the
initiatives that Bill just described, we will be
focusing our efforts on five main areas for the FDLP
during FYO-7.

Three of these initiatives deal with
education and outreach. First, we are developing a
plan for FDLP educational opportunities and outreach in
order to expand outreach to the Federal Depository
Library community and staff. We are currently in the
process of identifying points to incorporate in the
plan, and we will consult with the FDLP community to
insure that all important aspects captured. Kathy
Brazee, who is at the conference, is leading that
effort for us.

Secondly, we are implementing an online
educational and outreach program for the federal
depository librarians and staff. GPO has procured Opal
online programming for all libraries and interactive
web-based meeting and conference service for FDLP
training with Federal Depository Library participants.
Some of you in the audience took place in our beta

testing of Opal last fall, and we really appreciate your thoughts and feedback on that leading to our procurement. GPO can now provide training that users can access in their own facilities. Our first online educational presentation on the functionality of the catalog of U.S. government publications was produced and is now archived on the Opal website. The GPO Opal project team also recently participated in a Library of Congress flick live Opal presentation to learn about the practical aspects of posting our first live event.

Additional plans are being developed to present several live educational sessions this spring and summer, and we would really like your feedback on what the central themes may be. You can get in touch with myself or Lance to provide your ideas.

The third GIPRA initiative dealing with education and outreach involves developing a plan for educational opportunities for collaboration with FDLP stake holders and depository librarians. We've set a target for completion by August of this year for a plan that we are currently in the researching and consulting phase. We're consulting with internal GPO experts, as well as members of council, Go-to-Work, Double A, Double L and other library groups in order to develop the best plan of action for future collaboration.

Our fourth and fifth GIPRA initiatives deal with partnerships. Specifically, we are working on increasing the number of new content and service partnerships. In December, GPO signed an agreement with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and the University of Maryland Thurgood Marshall Law Library to provide access to electronic copies of commission publications. Hundreds of historical civil rights publications have been scanned to make this digital collection possible.

We are also in the final stages of completing a partnership agreement with Southern Methodist University for permanent public access to the library's World War II collection. Our second goal for partnerships is documenting and formalizing the partnership process working toward implementing standard operating procedures for all partnerships which will help streamline how they are developed and maintained with the community as we go forward. We have a target of July 2007 for implementation of these procedures.

Next, I'd like to talk about the 10 or so initiatives that we mentioned earlier and that Bill touched on as well.

First, authentication. As you just heard,

our authentication initiative is making progress.

Starting in May, GPO will begin authenticating PDF

files for the 110th public and private laws in a

testing capacity. The authenticated files will be

accessible to the public for a separate beta

application on GPO access. This has been closely

coordinated as well with the Office of the Federal

Register. Releasing a beta-authenticated 110th public

and private laws application will enable GPO to collect

valuable input and comments from all audiences,

including the Depository Library community. This data

is particularly important as we plan for more enhanced

authentication functionalities through our future

digital system.

          Next, I'd like to talk about harvesting. In

working toward this goal of building a comprehensive

collection of contact available through our

dissemination programs, GPO recently completed its

first automated publication harvesting pilot project.

The goal of the pilot was to test and develop automated

and accurate tools and technologies to discover and

access for scope determination and harvesting online

publications from the Environmental Protection Agency.

          GPO will continue to develop more fully

automated publication harvesting tools and

methodologies as part of our future digital system. With the completion of GPO's initial harvesting pilot and our ongoing harvesting efforts, GPO is in the process of developing plans for the overall acquisition, classification, cataloging, as well as storage, of web harvested content, including the publications available through the pilot and providing access to the them.

I encourage you to attend the council session on web harvesting to hear more about what we're doing and how you can help us.

Next, I'd like to talk about legacy digitization. In regard to digitization GPO has embarked on several activities in conjunction with the FDLP digitization plan. Priorities for digitization included legislative and regulatory materials that expand the coverage of the most popular GPO access databases. Library services staff have been working closely with GPO's chief technology office to develop specifications for converted content for the future digital system and testing those specifications by conducting a demonstration at GPO for the depository community during invitation session.

We are currently finalizing or briefing, as Bill mentioned, for our incoming joint committee on

printing to discuss the next steps for GPO beyond this
pilot that was approved by the former joint committee
on printing.

Additionally, while we are doing this, GPO
staff are participating with the National Digital
Strategy Advisory Board with the focus of developing
federal digitization standards. There will be a
council on this, and I encourage you to attend that as
well.

While we're working on new initiatives, we'll
also continuing to enhance existing services. The
catalog of U.S. government publications using the OPAC
module of the integrated library system has been live
now for just over a year. We went live March 6, 2006,
and in the first 13 months of CGP we had 17 million --
over 17 million successful requests.

The Z-39.50 implementation which Laurie will
talk about in more detail will be facilitated by the
new automation librarian who just joined GPO staff this
month. Testers of the Z-39.50 gateway received their
instructions last week. You can hear about the new
library directory as well at the electronic services
session this afternoon.

Next, I'd like to talk about the FDLP
Desktop. Last fall, we unveiled our preliminary beta

of a redesign of the desktop. And based on your
valuable feedback, we have a new version to present to
all of you at this conference. The innovative design
offers the use of the latest web technologies and tools
and also provides for opportunities, new opportunities
for interaction with your colleagues. The redesign
will have all of your favorite content from the old
desktop. What our hope is that it'll be in a new,
organized manner with additional customization options,
a site search and, again, opportunities for
collaboration. We invite you to come and view the new
desktop beta 2.0 at the electronic services section
that's being held today. Other features that will be
shown include our work on Opal and also browse topics.

        The next item on the list is Purls. A
working group within the library unit was established
to develop a plan to address a number of issues related
to persistent identifiers. The plan will include a
strategy for migrating from Purls to Handles. Handles
have been identified as the persistent identifier of
choice for the future digital system, and we are
planning a beta as a precursor to this that we plan to
release later this summer.

        Next, is my favorite topic: Ask GPO. GPO
recognizes the importance of responding quickly to the

depository community. The best and most visible way
that we can be responsive to answer your questions. We
are working on a redesign of the back end systems and
work flows and providing additional training of staff
to receive more comprehensive training. I am confident
that after completing these measures, you will see an
improvement in this service.

Staff are probably very tired of hearing from
me everyday that I really consider this to be the most
important thing that we do. In addition to the context
in our staff and our GPO sales operation, who are
responsible for routing your questions to us, I have
also appointed a full-time staff member in the library
unit to monitor the service more closely and to resolve
issues and problems. I believe in accountability in
regard to answering your questions is the most
important thing we do. I also want to encourage you,
and I've been told by staff not to do this, but I'm
going to do it, if at any time you do not get the
results that you seek through Ask GPO, please always
contact me at rdavis@GPO.gov, and I will make sure you
get the help that you need.

Next, I'd like to talk about assessments. At
the conference last fall, there was a council session
on library assessments. GPO took away from that

session a priority to revitalize our ongoing library
assessments to determine conditions in libraries as
mandated by Title 44. A project plan for doing this
has been developed, and we want to share information.
There will be council plenary session on public access
assessments on Wednesday morning.

Next, I'd like to talk metrics. Last fall I
mentioned in our update that we've taken on a project
management approach to all of the work that we do so
that we can better the progress of each initiative. I
consider permanence metrics to be a key integral part
of this process as they are to all of our day-to-day
operations.

Since December, monthly statistical summaries
of the activities of the Federal Depository Library and
the cataloging and indexing programs have been posted
on our FDLP Desktop. Please look for announcements on
the FDLP postings in the future. We hope that you're
finding this data useful, and we look forward to your
feedback on additional metrics that you'd like to see
us provide.

Additionally, we're in the process of writing
a job description for an operations research analyst
that should be posted in the next two weeks by our
Human Capitol Office, and this is looking for someone

with a quantitative background and also to help us
assess work flow operations. I encourage anyone with
an interest in that job to apply.

I've talked a bit about new initiatives and
services. I also want to talk about new content for
your library users. Last fall at the Depository
Library Council meeting, Ellen Hurst [phonetic], the
director of the National Technical Information Service
announced that NTIS wished to provide access to its
electronic content to the Federal Depository Library
Program.

At the end of February, after beta testing,
we successfully launched depository access to DARTS,
which stands for Depository Access to Reports Technical
and Scientific, which provides access to bibliographic
records and links to online versions of approximately
240,000 publications from 1964 to 2000.

At present, there are almost 250 libraries
that have registered for access to DARTS, and more
depositories are signing up everyday. More information
about the NTIS project will be included in our
presentations on Wednesday.

Pacer: GPO, as you know, has been working
for an awfully long time to gain depository access to
public access to court electronic records, commonly

known as Pacer. Last October, we made a presentation
to the working group requesting that it reconsider
GPO's request for access. As a result, the working
group recommended that the judiciary initiate a one-
year pilot project to assess the affect of free public
access through the FDLP. The pilot proposal must be
approved by the committee on court administration and
case management at its June meeting this year. If
approved, it will then be recommended to the judicial
conference which meets in September. In the meantime,
GPO and staff of the administrative office are working
together to define the scope of the project and the
procedures for implementation so it can be implemented
once the necessary approvals are received.

In addition to this as preparation, GPO will
be serving libraries to determine item selection
figures that we can share with the court administration
and case management committee before their meetings.

There are a couple of final housekeeping
items of note to mention before I wrap things up today.
The Double Tree Hotel in Arlington, Virginia, will be
the site of the next fall DLC meeting, and those dates
will be October 14th to the 17th, and we hope to see
all of you there.

I would also like to remind you that we are

now accepting nominations for the Federal Depository

Library of the year award. The chosen library will be

announced at an awards ceremony during the fall 2007

Federal Depository Library conference and Depository

Library Council meeting.

Additionally, I would like to remind everyone

that in keeping with our communications policies, all

depository libraries should have at least one staff

member subscribe to GPO/FDLPL since that is currently

our primary vehicle for online communication with the

library community.

In closing, GPO staff will be available

throughout the meeting. Lance Cummins, Nick Ellis,

Marian MacGilvray and Yvonne Louden have done an

incredible job putting this event together for us.

Feel free to engage all of us in conversation or ask

questions about the activities and projects that we are

working on. I, personally, feel very fortunate in

everyday to be working with such a dedicated group of

professionals in the library unit. And the way we

think about and approach our work revolves around the

partnership theme that I've been discussing today.

Joining me this morning to give you more

specific updates on the work activities in each of

their areas are Ted Priebe, director of library program

planning, Laurie Hall, Director of our Library

Technical Information Services, and James Mauldin, our

Archival Manager in Collection Management and

Preservation.

James has graciously agreed to step in for

Robin Hahn-Mohammed, who was not able to join us for

health reasons at this conference, but I can assure you

Robin is in touch with me almost on a hourly basis to

check on how things are going.

With that, I want to thank you very much for

your attention this morning, for your participation

during the next few days and most importantly, for your

support of the Federal Depository Library Program.

JAMES MAULDIN: Good morning, everyone. My

name is James Mauldin with the Office of Archival

Management Preservation. I'm here today pitch hitting

for Robin who couldn't make it. So, hopefully, I won't

mangle the presentation too bad.

Starting off the digitization of the legacy

collection, the library services and content management

business group has embarked on several activities in

conjunction with the GPO's vision and strategic focus

for our digitized collection of legacy government

publications held in the federal depository libraries.

GPO continues to work with library community

to acquire and convert legacy publications into searchable, digital files to insure permanent public access for these important materials.

Important steps that have been taken include developing specifications for converted content and quality control in conjunction with the federal system archival information package. The specification has been developed through internal and external reviews by federal agencies and universities involved with preservation and quality digitization. The specifications reflect proposed standards that were discussed at the GPO's meeting of experts as well as the digital library federation and NARA standards.

Testing the specifications for converted content we conducted a pilot demonstration that was presented to a library focus group. The system of demonstration concluded back in December of 2006. During that demonstration, we provided the library focus group with the axis derivative that was generated from these tiff images. They were to actually evaluate these PDF access derivatives to insure that these were visually appealing PDF derivatives from these tiff preservation files.

Acquiring FDLP publications for the conversion based on digitization priorities: Our

office is also in the process of acquiring massive

amounts of these publications that are on the list of

priorities. We have approximately two warehouses worth

of materials that we've already acquired. We're in the

process of doing inventory to insure that all the

priorities -- all the publications on the priority list

are obtained.

We're also developing a project plan for

collecting digitization. We're also cooperating with

the NDSAB, which is the National Digital Strategy

Advisory Board, in developing federal digitization

standards.

Online education with Opal: LSCM's first

online educational presentation with a functionality of

catalog of U.S. government publications was produced

and is now archived on Opal.

Plans are being developed to present several

more educational sessions this spring and summer.

Among the first will be a demonstration of the new

online depository library director, including

instructions on how each library can update it's

information in real time. We expect to present a

session on balancing security needs in a library with

FDLP access requirements. Dealing with problem

patrons, there are many topics to cover and welcome

suggestions.

The fall conference for 2007 meeting and the Federal Depository Library conference will be held from Sunday, October 14th, through Wednesday, October 17th, at the Double Tree Hotel in Crystal City located in Arlington, Virginia. Due to increased conferences activities in the D.C. Metro area, it is necessary to move the meeting up a week from its original date, and to also go outside of the downtown D.C. locale. A call for presentations and preliminary agenda will be made in the near future.

Spring 2008, Depository Library Council: The education and outreach staff are finalizing arrangements for the Spring 2008 DLC meeting. Location and base will be announced shortly. For those of you who are not familiar with our meeting, the spring meetings are usually held outside of the Greater Washington, D.C. area. The spring 2005 meeting was held in Albuquerque, New Mexico. 2006 was held in Seattle, Washington.

Intra-agency seminar: 2007 intra-agency depository seminar will be held in Washington, D.C. during the week of July 30 through August 3. This valuable seminar is absolutely free, except for your travel and lodging expenses, and brings participants

face-to-face with the federal agency speakers who
present new developments and their informational
products and training on how to use them. The sessions
are geared for new depository coordinators and those
who would benefit from reflective and government
publications and issues and services.

Request for GPO speakers: LSCM is happy to
provide speakers for Depository Library events and
promotions as resources and schedules permit. If you
would like GPO representatives to attend a function at
your library, please complete a submission form which
can be accessed via the FDLP Desktop.

The events can range from training workshops
to local area depository meetings, anniversaries,
celebrations and even informal assessment of your
library's adherence to the FDLP.

With current budget limitations, we are
focusing on attendance at events in which we have a
large number of projected attendees, areas that have
not had GPO visitations in recent years and those that
are coordinated with regional or statewide library
events.

The Depository Distribution Division: The
Depository Distribution Division has been focusing on
increasing the amount of time necessary to process

materials for shipment to depository libraries.
Despite staff shortages, the claims processing backlog
has been down for the last three months. On average we
are processing claims within three days of receipt. If
your library is having problems with distributional
profits and receipts, please feel free to ask the GPO
service or you may contact Robin Hahn-Mohammed
directly.

Recently GPO has been working with Fed Ex on
a problem associated with the master library address
file. If you have made an address change but continue
to receive material at your old address, please contact
us at the GPO.

Depository distribution is also under review.
They're looking where the review also includes the
determination of what scales are needed and the number
of FDA's required to meet the needs. The end result
should be better service to libraries. Your
organization reviews also includes an assessment of our
aging equipment and the need for replacements.

As has been discussed previously, the
continuing resolution does not -- does have an impact
on our ability to move forward on all of many acting in
the depository distribution picture.

Public access assessments: A renewed focus

is being put forth on GPO's responsibility under Title
44 to ascertain the materials distributed under the
FDLP are accessible, being maintained to insure
continued access by the general public and working with
staff throughout LSCM and our library partners.

GPO has to re-establish and re-affirm the
assessment program. Many of you may know of this
effort as it was done under the inspection program.
Onsite visitation, conference calls, website reviews
was done under the rules of self-study evaluations. It
will provide opportunities for library and GPO staff to
work together to insure an accessible and usable
depository operation.

Please attend the council session Wednesday
morning at 10:30 for discussion of our efforts to re-
establish this session. We look forward to your input
into this important process.

Communications for depository library: LSCM
continues to review its communication efforts to
identify new and improved methods of keeping the
depository community informed of events associated with
FDLP.

One area of review is the way administrative
notes are presently used to convey information that is
shared via one of the other mechanisms, discussion with

FDLPL, RSSP and special announcements.

Another area being reviewed is a new idea;
for example, a postcard format sent out via FDLPL
reminding libraries of this council meeting. Look for
more information on this project as we continue to
coordinate our efforts associated with our
communications policies and the FDLP Desktop update.

The Federal Depository Library of the year:
Finally, I would like to remind you of upcoming
deadlines for the Federal Depository Library of the
year. The process for applying for this award is
simple and can be found at the FDLP Desktop.

The Federal Depository Library of the year
award provides special recognition for a library that
furthers the goal of the Federal Depository Library
Program by insuring that Americans' public access has
free and permanent public access to this government
information through outstanding service to meet the
federal government information needs in the library
service area, creativity and innovation in developing
specific community programs for use of government
information or a dramatic increase in their community
usage of federal government information and leadership
in creating public service programs that can be
emulated by other fellow depository libraries.

This may be an opportunity for your library or a deserving depository library that does not attend library council meetings or conferences to be recognized for your efforts in a local community service area. GPO provides travel and lodging for the library director and the depository coordinator for the winning library.

All the different types of libraries are encouraged to apply and the nomination deadline is June 2, 2007. Look for a handout on this important award in your information packet.

Recent winners have included a public library, a state library and an academic library from a state university.

Thank you.

And up next is Teddy Priebe for the Library Planning and Development Division.

TED PRIEBE: Good morning and welcome. I'm Ted Priebe, and I serve as the Director of the Library Planning and Development. And I've been at GPO for over 16 years now. Over the past few years, I've been associated with several projects that are within library services right now, and I've been in this current position for or since March of last year.

I'm excited to be here today to talk to you

about the organization, as well as some of the exciting
initiatives we have that are going on right now.

Our work in library and planning and
development is focused on conceptualizing, planning and
implementing new initiatives for tangible, electronic
and web collections, along with strategic planning and
coordination of the execution of GPO responsibilities
under Title 44 for the FDLP, the cataloging and
indexing program, the international exchange service,
as well as the by-law distribution program.

Additionally, we are responsible for managing
and developing many of the online services provided by
GPO, including the FDLP Desktop, GPO access, U.S.
Government Bookstore, as well as Ben's Guide to the
U.S. Government.

Library planning and development does take a
very disciplined approach to the principles of project
management, and we focus much of our time applying
those principles to the support of the operational
units within library services, as well as other units
within the GPO organization.

Library unit members specifically, we have
three managers or three units within my divisions. One
is library services which is led by Janet Scheitle,
content management which is led by Lisa

Russell, and web content management which is led by
Karen Sieger.

The functions of library services
specifically include working operational areas to
develop policies and procedures and achieve strategic
goals, performing work to modernize and develop new
models for library services programs, development of
partnerships, as well as revising depository
administration policies and procedures.

The staff in content management under Lisa
focuses on planning for new GPO access products and
initiatives, expanding additional existing GPO access
content and services, as well as developing strategic
and operational plans pertaining to library services.
And they also perform analyses on cost and benefits of
potential and existing initiatives within our division.

Last, but not least, is our web content
management staff, and they are responsible for
maintenance and future design and architecture of GPO
access, as well as the desktop that you'll see an
exciting demonstration on this afternoon. This process
takes place using web standards, agency goals and the
living well.

Web content management is working towards the
goal of having subject matter experts update content on

a real time basis based on clearly defined work flows
and content submission guidelines in order to insure
consistency in an appropriate public base and adherence
to web standards.

So that's what we're looking for is to have
fresh content that's updated real time and eliminate
any stagnant content for the desktop, and that's one of
the big focuses that Karen will be focusing on.

I'd like to talk a few minutes now about some
of the key initiatives that are being addressed and
worked within my division. There are a couple of
technology based behind the scenes initiatives that
directly impact the online services that we provide.

First off, in immediately efforts toward a
GPO access update, we are finalizing the server
consolidation as an in-term resolution, so we are
working to replace WAIS, and that is our wide area
information service update. That's a topic that's a
contentious one, but I want to assure you that we are
working diligently to make the consistency and access
of that as approved as we can. It's not an ultimate
solution, but it should improve search functionality
and be a bridge for development to the future digital
system. This work will also aid efforts to migrate
content into FDsys.

During this process, we certainly value your input and thoughts and opinions as each day we are actively engaged in testing on GPO access. And if you have any problems that you come across, I want to encourage you to submit that inquiry to Ask GPO, and the link for that is www.GPOaccess.gov/help.

Moving on, as many of you know, GPO awarded a disaster recovery contract that will result in the migration of all-ways data consisting of over 2,800 databases across more than 40 applications.

Objectives of that contract will include providing a complete backup system to assure availability to all GPO web services. GPO has completed the first phase of the DR project which includes high availability, distributed content delivery and for portions of the GPO access applications.

The next phase of this contract, which has just recently been awarded, will be to migrate the remaining applications to a consistent data set using custom parsers. These will enable indexed, searchable data in a non-proprietary, non-ways format, as well as enhance components and features for GPO access applications.

This will also assist GPO in developing a

streamlined work flow using current search technology for its online data dissemination and deliver the content to FD-assist in the required format and structure.

There are also many initiatives that are underway that relate to our direct communication and collaboration with the you, our community.

As Ric mentioned, one of library services areas of focuses is on partnerships, which the library of planning and development has the lead in developing. Partnerships are the agreements between GPO and a depository library or a federal agency for joint projects that benefit the overall community.

We currently have 13 partnerships, and to date, most of those partnerships fall into two categories -- content and service. Content partnerships such as the University of North Texas, Cyber Cemetery assist GPO with providing permanent public access to that electronic U.S. government information. Partners agree to storage and free public access to the material covered for their partnership.

In the event that a partner is no longer able to do this, the partnership agreement does require that the agency or library transfer a copy of the content to GPO, which then makes the content available either

through GP access directly or in cooperation with
another partner.

Service partnerships assist GPO by providing
enhanced services to depository libraries. These
partnerships can focus on re-purposing of GPO provided
information as with the enhanced shipping list service
or providing services to depository libraries in the
public such as browse topics.

And a special note on our browse topics, with
the redesign, we have already received over 80 new
submissions, so that is a very positive step forward.
We look forward for more things to come in that area.

The partnerships, however, are not limited to
just these two categories. And I want to be clear that
we are always interested in partnership proposals that
fall outside of them. I encourage you and anyone that
has a project that they may think to be a good
candidate to contact me directly on that regard.

Next, I'd like to touch on the new federal
depository library handbook as work on that is steadily
progressing. As you may recall, the FDLP handbook
combines and updates the existing Federal Depository
Library manual and the instructions to depository
libraries to one online living document. Seven
chapters have been completely through the review,

posting and comment process, and five additional
chapters were posted for public comment earlier this
month.

Monday, May 7th, is the last day to make
comments on those chapters, and I would encourage all
of you to take an opportunity to review those and give
us any feedback that you may.

There are a few chapters that do remain to be
completed, and among these are a chapter on assessments
that would be drafted in no small part based on the
comments that we get from you at the conference. There
was a council session scheduled for that Wednesday at
10:30, and that will be to assist us in planning the
future of assessments for the depository libraries. I
encourage you to attend and provide us as much feedback
as you can.

For more information on our handbook, please
visit the FDLP handbook page that's accessible from our
desktop. We do plan to post final versions of the
majority of these chapters by this summer. And at the
time of the final publication, the existing manual
instructions will be superseded by that completed FDLP
handbook.

We will certainly notify you in advance with
the final completion date related to having the

previous material superseded, so that depository

coordinators can follow the FDLP handbook as policy and

guidance under the program.

Next, I'd like to take a bit about our

metrics reporting, as Ric mentioned. Internally, the

performance metrics provides GPO management with an

evaluation tool to reference key indicators and

successes in accordance with our unit's strategic

goals. Library planning and development is coordinating

a cross-functional team in that regard with a goal

enhancing the performance executive metrics summary

that we have been reporting on, and it's currently

being posted to the community.

As we continue to release this, we are

looking at new ways to utilize these metrics in the

future. And in the coming months, we do plan to

release up to two years' worth of legacy metrics that

we collected prior to our official launch in December,

and that was in no small order that some of the

suggestions and comments that all of you have made on

expanding that, so I want to thank you for those that

took the time to offer your thoughts and what would be

more beneficial to you.

Next, I'd like to talk about policies. As

mentioned, we know there are many policies that are

requiring updates and other needs -- other ones that
need to be developed to support the future of our
ongoing operations. These will be prioritized for
development, and the policies and procedures are being
considered in the following areas: administration of
the programs under the superintendent of documents;
cataloging and acquisitions; collection management;
education and outreach, which we'll have assessments;
digitization; distribution modernization, as well as
authentication. These encompass critical issues, such
as declining within the scope, procedures such as web
harvesting, and we will also be working on policies
such as persistent identifiers for web content,
separate bibliographic records and maintenance of the
Federal Depository Library Program handbook.

        Throughout the conference, Lisa, Karen and I
will be accessible, and please feel free to engage with
us on some of these exciting initiatives.

        I want to thank you for your time today, and
I certainly look forward to working with all of you in
the years to come.

        LAURIE HALL: I need a breather after this.
It seems like it's a little heavy. I'm last but not
least for those of you know my personality. I only
time I use "last" and "least" is when I'm in line at

the dentist.

So, I'm going to talk to you a little bit more about the operations. All the people that are back at GPO working today, although I'm not sure, we had some school closings back in our area, so I don't know if the staff is really back doing what they're supposed to be doing.

I -- my name is Laurie Hall, and I've been at GPO for 21 years, so I think I top a few of these people up here. And I thought about speaking, you know, just going on and telling you all about what's going on, but them I remind myself that many of you have never been to these meetings or you're new to the program, so a lot of things I say, you're going like "What is she talking about?"

So I thought I would do an overview of my organization, which is library technical information services, and some of the people that are involved in those operations you probably get e-mail from them. You know their names, but you're really not sure what they're doing. We've mentioned that we've reorganized a couple of times. People have moved. We've got new people, so I want to kind of go over that organization a little bit. And for those of you that are new, library technical information services is pretty much

like your traditional technical services operation in your library. We do acquisitions, cataloging, classification -- let me get my list here so I don't forget anything -- the shipping was creation, item number maintenance, authority control, Purl creation. We manage the integrated library system, the catalog of government pubs, and a whole range of other functions and applications that feed into those operations.

What I thought I'd do is update you on a few of the new people that we have. Ric mentioned that we just hired a new automation librarian. He's our team leader. His name is Ahn Liu, and he comes to us from Virginia Commonwealth University, which is in Richmond, Virginia, which is ALA-500 library ALA-500 is our integrated library system for those of you who don't know, and Virginia Commonwealth is a depository as well. So we're really, really happy to have him onboard. He's been here for two weeks, and he's already started working with Linda Resler and her staff on bringing in some of the new ILS products and services that we've talked about over the last couple of years.

We also have brought back to library info services, Joe McClain, who many of you have known from the past, who is a library inspector. He was in the

CIO operation for a year or so, and now he's back

working with me in my organization as one of my

managers. And Joe's responsibility is to work on FDLP

services and their operation. So he's responsible for

things like our legacy applications that manage your

item selection process, web tech notes, the superceded

list; those services that we have created over the

years for your use and for your collection development.

Now, Joe's only been back about two weeks, so, you

know, he needs a little bit of time to take on some of

these projects. And some of these projects are major

projects. So we're really glad to have Joe back. Plus

with his experience from the CIO organization, he's

really good at project planning and managing IT

projects, so we're happy to have him back.

I'll talk a little bit about some of our

organization. Mods Resler is here with us. She's in

the front row and is the head of our ILS operation and

automation. And also some of her staff is involved in

a classification of material.

We've had some issues over the years, and I

know some of you who've been here for a while are

reminded of this. We've had some security issues with

accessing. The ILS client, in-house, we now have some

access internally so our staff doesn't have to walk

down the hall, but we have it in our area, so that's

helped a lot of our projects moving forward. And we

hope to have a Citrix [phonetic] application installed

in the next probably six or eight weeks that will give

everyone on our staff and other members of the library

services and content management access to the client

for ALA.

So it's been kind of a hampering problem, but

we kind of hopefully have over that and once we get

going, we'll be bringing more and more services

forward.

We've also, as Ric announced, we sent out the

instructions for those of you who had volunteered for Z-

39.50 gateway testing. They went out Friday. If you,

you know, haven't been home, we do have copies of those

here and encourage anybody else that wants to test.

For those of you -- this is a really big deal

for us. It's now going to allow anybody, any libraries

to come in and grab records and copy catalog from our

CGP that goes back to 1976. So this is a really cool

thing, because if the basis of how we now will have

cooperative arrangements and exchange catalog records

back and forth, not only for us to go out to copy

catalog from your institutions and your libraries and

catalogs, but for you to come in and get our records.

There's going to be more about that. Linda and I will be available at 1:30 if you need to talk to us a little bit more about that.

We're also doing two other little enhancements. Right now you can e-mail yourself about 20 records, but they're in text format. When Linda and I get back from the meeting, we're also going to implement the dot MRC, which enables you to get a cataloging records in marked format through that Z-39. So you can e-mail yourself though. So we're expanding those -- your access to cataloging records. We're kind of on a phase approach, so be just looking for announcements through the list server. I'll tell you a little bit more about that.

The library automation staff, our team leaders, Mr. Liu, and the we have two or three other librarians, Violet Lee and Patricia DuPlantis. You may see them answering inquiries that have to do with the CGP or enhancements. So I kind of wanted to give you an idea of who some of these folks and where they are in the organization.

They're also working on the deployment of Metal-Lib, version four. That's just been announced by Exlibris, but we're doing our planning now, so we hope to have that hopefully by this summer. And

we're also going to be moving probably to version 18 of
ALA. We're on 16.2, and that's also in the planning
stages. It's an important upgrade to our software.

We also testing, as automation librarian,
they're testing a URL Purl checker enhancement
products that help us -- will help clean those -- the
Purls, the missing Purls, the lack of Purls, the
incorrect Purls, that are in the CGP, and that was a
little enhancement product that was developed for us by
one of our contractors. So you'll be probably seeing a
little bit more about that.

Oh, one of the big things that we're going to
talk about this afternoon is our new suite of services
for the Federal Depository Library Directory. There
were to handouts in your packet, one and two, to give
you an idea of what that new product will be. It's
going to be accessible through the CGP, and it's going
to replace the services that we have now on the desktop
for the directory. It's a basic database that we can
develop all different kinds of tools off of, and we're
going to be asking you to help participate in cleaning
up the data that is currently in the -- in your
director information. There's a bunch of additional
fields that we're really happy to talk about. We'll
talk about that at 1:30, but a couple of them we've

created some notes. So if, for instance, your library
is closed or being painted or you're moving, you can
post these notes so that anybody using the locate
library functionality in the CGP and wants to send
patrons to your library, will know that you may be
closed for a certain amount of time. And there's a
bunch of other features and new fields in addition to
the fields that already exist in the library directory
product. So, Linda and I are going to talk about that
this afternoon. But we are really kind of excited
about that. There's a lot of new features and
functions with that.

The second thing is the instructions on how
we want you to help us clean up that data and how we go
forward; so there's number one and two. So don't throw
them out. I almost did, but we made them one and two.
Somebody thought it was a duplicate, but it's not, so
there's two pieces to that information.

Let's see -- oh, most important, cataloging
and acquisitions. Not only are we doing regular
routine cataloging, authority control, the standard
things that we always do. The staff in all my areas in
LTIS work on all kinds of projects, project team
members on a lot of the projects that Ted and Ric have
described, so we're very, very busy all the time.

There's really never a dull moment. So if we wonder

sometimes why oh, cataloging seems a little bit, you

know, the numbers are a little bit low, we may have had

staff that are routinely cataloging move over and work

on the web harvesting team. So my staff are very

equipped to move from project to project, and they're

often called upon to help on a lot of variety of

projects, not only in library services and content

management, but we're working on projects that exist as

well.

In acquisitions, I have a fairly new manager.

His name is Jeff Horbinski. I think some of you have

probably received e-mails from him. He's very busy

doing lots of identification. He's talking to agencies

a lot about their new products and services, developing

those relationships with agencies. He's been one of

the primary team members on the EPA web harvesting team

trying to figure out what this material is that we're

getting, how we're going to bring it in, how we're

going to bring it into the work flow, acquire it,

classify it, catalog, identify if it's in scope or not,

so he's been very busy.

In the acquisitions, we continue to use a

wide variety of sources to identify new publications

that we bring in. GPO express program I think we

talked about that in October, working with Fed

Ex/Kinko's. Actually, some of us were kind of

skeptical about how many titles we were going to get

through that, but we've been very surprised. We get

between 50 and 100 titles through that program every

month from a lot of the regional offices where Fed

Ex/Kinko's work is being done. So we were really

surprised that we were getting a lot of very good

quality publications that would have never come through

the program.

We're also continuing to monitor the lost

docs, and we really appreciate everyone who sends stuff

in the lost docs and get back those publications into

the work flow process.

The cataloging staff is headed by Jennifer

Davis, and two supervisors, Valerie Martens and Steve

Utoff, and I know you get a lot of inquiries

answered from quite a few cataloging staff, especially

on Purl resolving or why haven't we cataloged

something, so I just wanted to mention their names so

if you get a response back from them, one of our key

people that answers Ask GPO questions from the

cataloging unit is Donna Kramer, so I'm sure a lot of

you have gotten responses from Donna.

With all this other stuff going on, we really

continue to catalog at an increased level since October

alone of 2006. We've cataloged 8,565 titles. We've

created over 5,565 Purls, and we've created over 502

authority headings, and that's names, subjects, series.

So we're really, really an active participant in lot of

the -- in all of the Library of Congress cooperative

cataloging projects for those of you who don't know.

We're in CONCER [phonetic]. We're a member of the

serials group in CONCER. We contribute name

authorities to the name authority cooperative projects.

We're a BIDCO member, and we create ISSN's for U.S.

government serials. So we're a very active participant

in the library cataloging world.

We just updated through the last couple of

months the abridged cataloging guidelines, and that was

done in the October meeting. Starting today, if

there's any back at GPO in cataloging, we are now

cataloging more things in the abridged level. And

those guidelines were posted last week. And we did

receive comments from you and incorporate some of those

comments into those guidelines.

One other thing about the CONSER for you who

are interested in that, we have not yet implemented the

CONSER standard record for cataloging serials. We're

following that debate in the CONSER organization, and

once CONSER decides when they're going to implement
that standard level record, we will follow suit, but we
will announce that. And I think it's anticipated that
the CONSER group will make that decision at their May
meeting at the Library of Congress. So we -- all of
our staff has been trained. We're ready to do that.
We're just waiting for their official roll out.

We're also doing a lot of little projects
within the cataloging acquisitions unit. We've started
a Brief-Fibs project. And for those of you who don't
know how our operation runs, we've been cataloging in
OCLC for a year. Well now we have our own integrated
library system. We are going to be changing our entire
work flow.

So one of the first projects we've started is
what we are calling the Brief-Fibs record project,
which means we're going to start adding publications
from the very beginning from the acquisitions into the
cataloging module. And you'll be able to see some of
those early brief acquisitions records and watch the
progress as they go through the system.

When we get back, we're ready to put an
announcement out and give you some examples -- show you
some of the examples of what these brief records will
look like. We are also in that project testing moving

to a separate record approach -- I get my "S's" wrong,
single versus separate -- separate record approach, so
you will see brief records for formats that we don't
distribute, and then full and abridged levels records
for formats that we do distribute. So, there'll be a
lot more coming about that.

We're also testing our statuses in the ILS.
We're testing batch loading to OCLC and trying to get
our staff more acclimated to working in the ILS. So
there is going to be a lot more about that project
shortly.

We're also finalizing the implementation of
putting congressional serial set information in the
CGP. We started that about I think last spring, and
with the 105th Congress, you'll see that individual
records for hearing, reports and documents have now a
440 series number and a serial set number. And we're
also checking in in the serials module the serial set
volumes themselves. So we still have to take on the
challenge of cataloging and dealing with serials in the
serial set, but we're pretty much implemented getting
the serial set information in this new CGP.

We also have two major projects on for those
of you -- there's -- and last time we counted there's
5,000 plus active serials that we handle in our work

flow on a regular basis. We have to start checking

those into the ILS. Right now we're only checking in

the essential titles, which is about 10 to 50 titles.

We are going to be migrating all of the serial check-in

into the ILS. That's a really major project, so we

were already starting the planning process of that.

I did briefly mention, but we're spending a

lot of time working with the FDsys because the ILS is

an integral part of the FDsys operation. We're looking

at metadata, migration, system interfaces. So Linda

and her staff at this point are working with Gil and

Mike's staff on work flows, metadata exchange, a wide

variety of issues that are helping us bring up the ILS,

but also get them prepared for the releases of the

FDsys. And what we're trying to be very careful about

is make sure that when we deploy something in the ILS,

it's going to match with a future release. We don't

want to get out of balance, so that's a really critical

part of what Linda and some of my staff members are

doing.

A couple of other little things that we've

been working on, and I talked about in October we have

been working with defense technical information

service, D-TIC, on their automated metadata extraction

process.   We have a memorandum of understanding that

they are currently reviewing to start an R&D and metadata extraction process with them. So we were thinking about using batches and samples from the EPA pilot project to send through and automated metadata extraction process. So they're looking at our MOU right now, and we hope to begin, you know, sending some sample stuff down and developing the templates in the next couple of months. So I'm excited about that.

We also have been working on a outsourcing project with the historic shelf list that goes back to 1880. It's over one million cards, and those were the cards that made up the printed monthly catalog. We sent out a solicitation and reviewed the proposals, and it became very clear that our strategies between the proposers and we're not quite on target. So, we cancelled the solicitation and we just have re-issued hopefully this week another proposal to migrate printed cards to automated mark records. So there should be more on that shortly.

So I think that kind of wraps it up. I may have missed some things that we talked about in the last three or four months, but if anybody -- you know, come see me or Linda or, you know, throughout the conference we're here. If we have a specific question that relates to a specific cataloging record, I'd be

more than happy to take it back to Jennifer and her

staff and have them figure out an answer, but, you

know, we're more than happy to take anything back or

any questions you have, so, thank you for your time.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Well, we're right -- we are

right at 10:00 o'clock, but is there any burning

questions from council they would like to ask. If not,

we will take our break.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I just have a quick one.

Do we have a time line on the interim placement of the

WAIS database?

TED PRIEBE: Not a definitive -- does this

work. Not a definitive one. What I was referencing is

we have current configuration that's over 20 some

servers, and a lot of the problems associated with the

consistencies are indexing problems related to those

servers. We're consolidating them into four major ones

that will enhance consistency, specific to being

completely off of WAIS that is probably in line with

some of the first release of the future digital system

and how content will be accessed.

So, I think Mike and his group may talk a bit

more about that, but I'd be looking more at release one

of FD-6.

RIC DAVIS: If I could just add to that, Ric

Davis, GPO, for the court reporter.

I think Ted summed that up clearly. What we're doing right now is we're making enhancements so that what we have in terms of using the WAIS application, it functions as best it can, but we're looking at replacing search and retrieval functionality with the first beta test that Mike and his staff are going to talk about, and then the first public release. The FDLP Desktop redesign that you'll see later today, I'm happy to report, does not use WAIS search technology.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Anything else from council? If not, we will take a break and will start back at 10:30 with the FDsys update. Thank you.

(Off the record from 10:03 a.m. to 10:34 a.m.)

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: For starting with council is that since we're doing pod casting and we have a court reporter, please remember to identify yourselves when you ask a question. And also with the members of the audience, when they have a chance to go to the microphone and particularly again tomorrow afternoon during the open session, we will need you to identify yourself and so that will help us greatly, again, particularly with the pod cast and with also getting your names, being able to get back to you.

Okay. A couple of announcements, the
following states will be meeting as one group to go to
the regional selectives lunch together. They'll be
meeting at 12:15 in the lobby of the Plaza Building,
which is the one across the street -- Georgia, Alabama,
Minnesota, South Dakota, South Carolina and North
Carolina. Well, we're all far from home and there
aren't that many of us.

Okay. The other announcement I'd like to
make is that council has decided -- I mentioned
yesterday that we were working on some recommendations,
so we're going to have a working session from 3:30 to
5:00 today. That is in the Aspen Room. I do not want
to discourage anybody to attend, but it is a small
room, and there's 13 of us on council, and I was told
that the capacity is somewhere between 15 and 20.

But again we do want to have a working
session. We wanted you all to know about it, and we
plan on working on some recommendations that we have --
that we have in draft form currently, and we may be
working on some others.

And we would like to start now with -- I'd
like to introduce Mike Wash, and he will start off the
FDsys update.

MIKE WASH: Thanks, Bill. Hi, everyone.

It's nice to be back.

We have an update for everyone on FDsys today to give you an idea of where we are along a program that's really been underway for almost three years now. It was actually just about a year ago -- it was at spring conference in Seattle -- when we launched our RFP, our request for proposal for our master integrator.

So in the last year, we have awarded a contract to Harris Corporation. And if you recall, those that were with us in Washington last fall, there was some folks from Harris Corporation there talking about their process and how they would develop a system like FDsys.

And, now, you know, we're six months later and we're well along the process of developing the system for a first deployment. So we're going to share with you where we are, and some of the things and features that you will see as the system starts to roll out.

But before we really get started, a couple of things I would like to say is I would like to really express my thanks to Bill Turri and also Ric Davis. As you all know, we've had some changes at GPO. Bill Turri in his acting public printer role has been a

tremendous supporter for this program since the
beginning, and he continues to do that and is
supporting us throughout this process, so that is --
it's really great.

And Ric, Ric has been a strong supporter of
this from the beginning. Part of the team for a while
and now back into his role in the library programs, but
he continues to be a strong supporter, and we really
couldn't do it without Ric and Bill's continued support
really picking up for Bruce James, so I really
appreciate that.

So for the outline today, I'm going to give
you a brief overview of the program. Some of you may
be new and haven't heard about FDsys too much in the
past. And we're not going to go all the way back to
the beginning of how we started this, but we'll give
you a snapshot of why we're doing it and some of the
challenges that the agency is facing which has led us
to need to do something like FDsys.

We're going to talk about our communications
plan and what we're doing there with continued outreach
defined. You know folks that are going to be using
this system and continuing to work on finding what's
really needed now and as we go into the future, because
this really is a journey. What we have in our releases

that we're going to talk about are the beginning
stages. And as the program continues to move forward,
there's opportunity to add new features and functions.
And for us to do that effectively, we need to continue
outreach, and we call that communications in working
with the users and partners in the system.

Then we're going to dive right into what's
going on with our releases. Releases 1-B is an
internal pilot that is currently underway. And then
we'll talk a little bit also about 1-C, which is our
first public release which is going to be at the end of
this year. And then we'll hopefully have about 30
minutes or so for questions and answers, depending on
how long it takes me to figure out how to use this.

Challenges to GPO's mission: The mission of
GPO hasn't really changed, but with nature of
technology that we've talked about in past sessions on
this, the technology has changed the way we need to do
our business. Access to information and publications
now is widely expected to be available in electronic or
digital form. So to be able to do that, you have to
have a system that can work well in a digital
environment and continue to evolve to meet needs as the
needs for access change.

The information has to be authentic and

verified to be the correct version. That's nothing new

for GPO, and the partners in the library program that's

what we're all about. In a digital world it's more

challenging to do that and do that effectively and also

to stay ahead of all of the security breaches that

happen daily at an increasing rate. So for us to be

able to work effectively in an authenticated fashion is

a tremendous challenge for us, and we have plans of

continuing to move forward to make sure that we can do

that. And the information needs to be available almost

immediately.

And in some cases, the digital information is

available before the printed information. So, you

know, the nature of digital and digital processing and

working in a digital environment to support print

allows information to be available in electronic form

long before it's available in a printed and published

form. We do that on a daily basis wit the

Congressional Record. The record goes up a few hours

before it's actually distributed. And now it's

becoming another one of those widely accepted

practices.

And then there's the issue of preservation.

For us to be able to meet our mission, we have to

preserve information and make that information

available even formats and forms that we can't even predict today. So much of the way that we have developed the concept for this system and the way that we're managing the information within FDsys is really all about preservation so that we can move into the future as there are new formats, new operating systems, new ways of viewing information so that we can make that information available in the forms that are needed at the time that they're needed. Another very, very difficult task, but fortunately it's not just GPO struggling with this. There are other agencies and lots of good research that's underway that we're leveraging on this one.

Capability overview: This is really one of our staple slides and presentations. We really are working on a system that's going to automate the collection and dissemination of information in an electronic form for all three branches of the government. The information is going to be permanently available in an electronic format, so think back to the challenges of preservation and permanent access and authenticity. Those are really covered in the first of bullets.

Access to web searching and viewing and downloading and printing: As Ric mentioned earlier,

we're moving away from WAIS and we want to do that to
really modernize some of the searching and retrieval
type of capabilities within GPO. And it's another one
of the aspects of the system that we know that we have
to flexible and nimble and being able to add new
features to that as new tools and technologies become
available. So that accessibility for search and
viewing is extremely important.

And availability for conventional and on-
demand printing. You know there's a lot times concern
that what we're doing is eliminating the need to print.
And actually that's not the case at all. We believe
that print is going to be around a long time. The form
and the mode of printing is likely to change as it has
in desktop printing, but the availability to support
print needs to be maintained.

So conventional printing for high volume
printing is certainly a part of the system to support
that type of output to allow high volume conventional
printing to take place much like we do with the
Congressional Record and Federal Register on a daily
basis.

But there's also the expectation to be able
to support more of an on-demand printing, on-demand
being smaller quantities even as a quantity size of

one, much like we do with our Kinko's, our Fed

Ex/Kinko's partnership. Small quantities can be

supported today with electronic publishing techniques.

So our system needs to be able to support both,

so conventional, high volume, as well as on-demand, and

the boundary between on-demand and conventional changes

on a very rapid basis today. As technologies evolve at

some point in the future, everything will be on-demand.

And you can't say when that will be, but it'll happen

so that you'll be able to print one quantity --

quantity of one rather, or you'll be able to print

thousands, and it really will be the same type of work

flow. It's just setting the quantity at a different

level.

So where are we? We've talked about three

releases. And if you roll back the clock to late 2004

when we first talked about this system, we estimated

the cost of development and deployment to be about 29

million dollars. That was in the strategic vision that

was published in December 2004, and low and behold,

it's going to cost about 29 million dollars.

Of the schedule, we also talked about not in

the strategic vision, but in our planning process, we

talked about subsequent releases. So there's going to

be three significant releases associated with FDsys in

the form that we have really captured in our

requirements today. But remember, this is a journey,

so that either it'll likely be release four, release

five, release six, where there's going to be new

features and functions put in. They'll be smaller in

magnitude if we've done a good job of systems

engineering where the core foundation of the system

would be put in place in release one with enhancements

in release two and release three.

          We're about halfway through release one. And

the price tag on release one is 18.5 million dollars.

And earlier Bill Turri mentioned that we're two-thirds

of the way through the spending on FDsys. That's not

quite correct. We're two-thirds of the way through

planned spending on FDsys. So of the 18.5 millions

dollars for release one, we haven't spent all of that

yet, because we have now until December 7th -- or

December of `07 to spend that money. But at that

point, we will be about two-thirds of the way through

the spending profile that was anticipated back in the

strategic vision of 2004.

          A significant part of that spending on

release one is for infrastructure. And what we've been

doing so far on release one has been a lot of the

development activities where Harris, our partner, has

been putting the software elements in place and helping

us select technologies to use for FDsys. So most of

the expenditure to date has been contractor dollars.

But as we move into the late summertime frame

and into the fall, we'll start buying storage,

networking, computing platform and other IT type of

infrastructure base to work for the system itself.

Release two and release three are 10.5

million dollars, and that is one of the line items

that's in the FYOA appropriations request, 10.5 million

dollars, and that's what Bill was referring to as the

cost to finish FDsys. So that's finishing FDsys

through release two and release three. That work is

expected to start late this year, and you know the

development activities on release two will start as we

really start rolling off some of the design activities

and development activities on release one in the fall,

so that appropriation is going to be an important

element for us to really to be able to maintain and

continue.

And if you look at the -- I know that the

print is kind of small, but if you look at some of the

things that we're putting in place in release two,

that's where we're putting in preservation processing.

So we're putting in the information management aspects

in release one to allow us to start to do the

preservation processing in release two.

So for us to really fulfill our mission, the

release two and release three are critical elements of

FDsys. We have been very active with Congress in our

oversight committee in helping them understand the

elements of FDsys and the release two and release three

particularly as we've gone through the appropriation

hearings. And they understand that, and they view

FDsys as a very high-priority program for GPO so we

think that is really great news. But you can see from

this chart that we have staged releases that are

overlapping somewhat.

So where are we? And then I'll turn it over

to the rest of the folks here that can give you much

more detail.

Release 1-B, which is the internal pilot, is

in the development phase. And the way development goes

or the way system development goes, there's a

requirements phase, which we've been a very active part

of telling it what it is we want to do. Then there's a

design phase where technologists and engineers get

together and figure out how they want to get it done.

And then after you finish the design, you actually

start developing it. So you start actually doing what

the design was documented to say that you're going to
do.

So we're past the design stage on 1-B. We're
in the development stage of 1-B. And detailed internal
testing is going to start next month. And actually an
element of FDsys is already up and running. Last week
there was a full piece of the system from taking
information in, managing it and making it accessible
from the development environment. So we've seen a
little itty-bitty FDsys. So as we go forward, it'll
start to grow and we'll gain more functionality.

Internal release of 1-B has been demonstrated
and that was just last week. Beta testing of release 1-
B is planned for the summer, and there's going to be
some further discussion about that.

We want to get you and other folks exposed to
the system so you can start to see and feel and
participate in it, because it's still a wonderful
opportunity for us to make changes as required. We've
tried to capture requirements as best we can, but you
know talking about it and writing it down is one thing.
When you actually start using it, always something new
comes up.

And system design and review for release 1-C,
the first public launch will be completed in early May.

So lots of activity going on right now for that first design review of release 1-C. And each of these are building blocks. So we're taking 1-B and we're adding design and development to it to create 1-B just as when we go to release two, we'll be building on top of that. So it's not like a brand new thing starting with 1-C. It's starting with what we have and adding more to it.

So that's a quick status. With that, I'll turn it over to Carrie Gibb to talk about communications, and then on to a few other folks to talk about the specifics of the system.

CARRIE GIBB: Thanks, Mike.

I'm Carrie Gibb. I've been with GPO for about four and a half years. And I've been working on FDsys going on four months. I'm very excited to be here and working on the project.

I'm going to speak to you today briefly about our communication activities, where we've been and where we're going and a little bit on beta testing.

Over the past few years, our communication strategy has been focused on creating awareness of FDsys in capturing the needs of user groups. And while we're still focused on awareness and capturing needs, we're excited that our outreach efforts have evolved into validating where the system will actually meet the

needs of the stake holders.

Since the fall Depository Library conference, we've had many opportunities to engage users including conferences, a briefing with the legal community that was held in March, and we're hoping to establish a working group from that, ongoing communications with the congressional working group, the inter-agency council on digital contents submission or ICDCS, and GPO's business units.

We will continue our outreach efforts throughout the year with engagement in multiple conferences, including archiving 2007, Special Libraries Association Joint Conference on Digital Libraries, ALA, Double A, Double L, and the Society for American Archivists.

We're also planning focus groups with you, the library community, federal agencies and the 508 community, as well as interaction with the Federal Electronic Document Systems Group, or FEDS.

I do want to point out that we welcome any opportunity to open dialog with you or communications suggestions that you have, and if you can do that by e-mailing us at PMO@GPO.gov, we would appreciate that. I'll say that again later. Okay. Brainwash everyone into memorizing the e-mail address.

MIKE LANDGRAF: I'm like R. Davis.

CARRIE GIBB: Poor R. Davis [laughter] [indecipherable]. That would work as well.

Now moving onto the information that I'm sure you're curious about, beta testing. Beta testing for release 1-B will occur during the summer, as Mike said. The initial beta testing will be a formal two-week process and users will have remote access to the system. GPO will be providing more information on beta testing at some point in May.

And I do want to point out that there will be a limited number of users participating in the beta test. However, there's going to be many opportunities to interact with the system before the first public release in December. So if you're interested in participating in user testing, focus groups or any other outreach activity that we set up, we would highly encourage you to e-mail us again at PMO@GPO.gov and let us know. We like to keep a list and be able to reference that and usually act as the people are interested in the system development.

And reiterate what Mike said, release 1-B is an internal release of FDsys. [inaudible]

MATT LANDGRAF: [inaudible]

CARRIE GIBB: Yeah, okay.

It is going to lay the foundation for the initial public release in December. And the core functionalities of release 1-B are content submission, content packaging and metadata, content access and delivery.

And Matt Landgraf's actually going to talk about the content submission.

MATT LANDGRAF: Good morning, everyone.

As Carrie said, my name is Matt Landgraf. I've been with GPO for about seven years now, and have been on the FDsys program for going on three years now from the very beginning. So, we're in the really exciting phase of FDsys, so we're actually really excited about where we are.

So I'll talk to you a little bit content submission. As most of you know, content submission -- with the whole point behind content submission is to provide an easy and efficient for content originators to submit content and associated metadata into the system that can be then preserved and made available through FDsys and FDLP. So we envision mechanisms to receive content and metadata related to the three types of content that we see in the future digital system.

There is the depository content from federal agency publishers. There's also harvesting content

from varying websites. There's actually a session on
web harvesting tomorrow at 1:30, so I encourage you all
to attend that and find out more about where we're
doing with harvesting content and how that sort of ties
into the future digital system.

Then we have converted content from tangible
formats by GPO and its partners. We have -- there's
actually a session on Wednesday morning I believe on
the converted content efforts that are going on in GPO.
So there's a few sessions here that will sort of help
bridge the gap.

So just a little bit of information about
what we see the functionality being for release 1-B, as
far as content submission goes. We see it sort of as
baseline functionality and using this functionality as
sort of a building block in order to get user feedback.
And we mentioned beta testing earlier to, you know,
gain that user feedback and then incorporate that
feedback into the first public release of the system
which is release 1-C.

So really the baseline functionality which
you'll see in a little bit is providing an interface
for content originators, and this is federal agency
publishers and congressional users, to deposit content
and metadata into the [indecipherable] digital system

and then capture all the order information that has to do with that content. Most of the orders that we get in from federal agencies currently have to do -- or sort of revolve around the printing process, which we'll go into a little bit more. But it'll capture all that information as well and store that within the pieces.

So a peek ahead -- just to peek ahead to release 1-C's planned functionality for content submission, will have all the functionality that I just mentioned. But a few more things will be added to sort of enhance the user experience. Bulk submission of content will be implemented within release 1-C, and that is for more of our -- the content originators that submit content to us very often, agencies like the EPA and DOE and -- but also our congressional users who submit, for example, copies of bills to us everyday. They'll be able to submit those in bulk. In the system we'll be able to handle that.

But once again we'll capture all the order information, but also try to sort of integrate that with GPO's current procurement processes.

There'll be enhanced content enhanced interfaces for content originators, mainly people like Congress and the Office of the Federal Register who

have really detailed needs and we'll try to address those in release 1-C as well.

And then there'll also be some help features on release 1-C that'll sort of guide you through the process.

So what I have on the screen now and we're going to go in and look at a couple of the graphic user interfaces that we've developed for content submission. This is what we see as sort of a home page for the content originator. This will be a federal agency publisher.

But just to give you a little bit of information on sort of how we got here, we started off really with the goal of making these interfaces easy to use and really improving the whole user experience with GPO and our agency customers.

So we have a lot of forms currently in our process, and they're mainly paper-based forms -- things like the standard form one, standard form 952. I could spout off a whole list of other forms that we use.

But what we really wanted to do is really streamline that process, alleviate any kind of duplication with those forms and make it sort of a seamless user interface. And we started with, you know, asking the experts within GPO, within our

customer services -- within our customer services organization. So to really give to the customer on sort of what forms are normally used, what fields are normally used on those forms and develop a graphic user interface that sort of makes that process a little bit easier in an online environment.

So the whole page that you see, I won't go into this too much, but you'll see that agencies have the opportunity to look at the current jobs that they have with GPO, and that's what you see in the main part of your screen. They'll be able to see the title, the job number and sort of the status of their order. But also on the left hand side, they have some other features. They can submit a new order for print. They can just upload their files. And I'll go a little bit more into that.

This is just an example of one of the pages that they'll see when they click on new order for print. We've used sort of a wizard and tab-based approach in order for them to sort of logically go through the order process. And once again, this is based upon the forms, but, you know, we've tried to alleviate some of the duplication and the overlap between a lot of these forms. So a user will be taken to a place like this where they can click on edit on

this page and actually enter the information into the system.

I just wanted to briefly show you the file info tab which allows agency content originators to upload their files into the system. From this page, they'll have an easy to use interface where they can click on upload files and be taken to a page where they can browse their directory and actually add files to the system. They're also able to give us some indication of what they're submitting to us as well, whether the files are in data format, whether it's, you know, for purposes of preservation.

We also have a tab within the wizard to provide publication metadata. This is going to be important metadata from when we get into both the entering of mandatory metadata within the system, but also for cataloging, things that we can in some cases only get from the content originator.

So with that, that was my attempt at a segue way there into content metadata. Kate Zwaard will be taking over.

KATE ZWAARD: Thanks, Matt.

Hi, everybody. I'm Kate Zwaard, and I'm a program planner on the content processing and preservation team.

For the past few years, we've given a lot of thought to how we'll store, organize and share information about the content we'll be preserving and providing access to. And a big part of the 1-B pilot is sort of figuring out our packaging structure and metadata will flow through the system. So it's really exciting for us to see this kind of come together and see actual packages coming out of the system, and so it's kind of fun to talk about.

So, what is metadata? There's an old joke that goes, there's a hot air balloonist and he's kind of lost and so he descends to ask directions. And he shouts down to a guy on the ground, and he says, "Can you tell me where I am?" And the guys says, "You're in a balloon about 100 feet up." And when people say metadata is data about data, that's kind of how I feel. It's a 100 percent, but it is absolutely useless.

So a way to think about metadata is the information that we'll need from a human prospective, from a system prospective to provide access to and to preserve and to understand the content. Of course, information professionals have been immersed in metadata creation and management for many, many years. And now popular websites like library thing and flicker and delicious have made it really easy for general

users to under what metadata does and how it helps us understand our information.

What is a package? A package is metadata and content together forever. FDsys follows the WAIS reference model which you probably have heard a million times if you've been to any of our presentations before. The reference model helps us understand and talk about how we manage information over time. It recommends that a system that follows the reference model provides foundation services like ingest, preservation and access.

And to facilitate this, we're using a design based on content packages, which is concept derived from the Warwick framework. The Warwick framework is a container-based approach in which discrete packages and metadata are aggregated into conceptual containers. And that helps insure that metadata and content are associated together for the lifetime of the publication.

So here's a little diagram about our information package life cycle. This diagram and the other one that we'll be talking about is also tech-line. So information will get to FDsys through submission by agency authors and printing specialists, also through harvesting of fugitive documents and

scanning tangible publications.

FDsys will take the submission package, put it through a series of validation checks on the metadata and content and turn it into archival information package which will be preserved in perpetuity.

An access content package is then derived from the IP, and it will contain the metadata and various formats of the content you need to facilitate access. And then the user can then call upon the ACP to create a dissemination information package. And each of these packages are designed around the metadata necessary for their step in the life cycle.

Next, is data about metadata. The container we're going to use to associate our metadata with content has to be easily understandable. It has to be open. It has to be interoperable. So we're using metadata and coding and transmission standard, which is a standardized framework for holding and exchanging metadata, and it kind of works the way our marked record facilitates that kind of exchange now. This standard is common practice in the preservation community, which means that it's well understood, it's supported and used, and it's produced by the Library of Congress standards office and the Digital Library

Federation.

So through METS we can reference our various
other metadata that we have associated with the
content. Content metadata, but METS does not prescribe
the exact flavor of metadata we have to use to describe
our content. It does make some recommendations. We
know that new schemas will be updated and developed, so
I suggest that you use the schema service in which you
can register the schemas that we'll be using to make
sure that the FDsys understands how to use it and what
all the elements mean.

METS has places to reference or embed the
other schema, as defined by the Digital Library
Federation, descriptive, administrative and structural.
Structural metadata allows us to describe how the
various files in a content package interrelate, as
shown by the diagram.

So you start out with a content package which
is the whole thing all together, the big bag. Then you
have the XML wrapper which is the METS, and that
interrelates all the different little piece parts of
the file, of the content and also the metadata. And
you start out with our content. And a contact package
can have various renditions. For example, if you have
a publication that was a brochure say, "A Healthier

You," we'll have one rendition. That'll be the
original file, maybe a court file, so you'll have one
file that'll be the court file itself and then a bunch
of different -- and the trials associated with it, and
then you may have another rendition that's an access
optimized PDF, and you might have another rendition
that's an XML text extract.

And then you have the metadata in another
folder and associated with each rendition we'll have
information about the representation, descriptive
metadata, preservation metadata, technical metadata and
administrative metadata.

Descriptive metadata is information about
intellectual contact similar to a standard
bibliographic record. Each package in FDsys -- and you
can think of a package as one edition of a publication
-- will have a mods [phonetic] record. The mods
record will be the system's main container and source
for bibliographic information. But metadata and other
schemas submitted to the system will be associated and
used and examples of that include Dublin core,
[indecipherable].

Administrative metadata is information that
we need for handling maintenance and archiving of an
object. Each representation and each digital object in

the system will have a premise object and fee file to record information needed for preservation processes. Premise agent entity event files and -- I'm sorry -- premise agent entity files and event entity files will be used to record chain of custody and program [indecipherable] information.

Other schemas that we might use for administrative metadata include technical information like mix.

So, I just wanted to go through a little bit about how publication and FDsys will get its descriptive metadata. And metadata in a thesis is kind of like the blob. It starts with a little nugget and just keeps growing.

A publication will be submitted to FDsys with metadata. Sometimes the publication will be submitted with a lot of information like who created it, what other versions have been published or an abstract. Other times the publication will be submitted with a minimum of metadata. And what we'll have is mostly a system derived like what the file format is, and the agency name of the [indecipherable] user.

The content being submitted is constantly routed to a GPO content evaluator for added metadata before it's released to the public and added to the

archive.

The system will determine whether it knows the type of content being submitted, and if it knows it and it's well structured, we'll be able to extract metadata to populate a mods record. For example, an issue of the Federal Register being submitted will be a -- we'll know the volume number and the agency that an article is about, and we'll able to extract that into metadata.

And that's how content in most of [indecipherable] will give you access. Applications will get their mods records.

When a publication is ingested into FDsys, it also becomes a candidate for cataloging. Now every item in scope for GPO's dissemination programs will get a catalog in the record. The volume of information that we expect is too large to make that practical.

During the harvesting pilot, one of our vendors called and found more than 200,000 in school publications, an EDA website. At current staff, it would take GPO about four years to catalog that information alone.

So as GPO begins to understand the corpus of its collection under FDsys, cataloging priorities will have to be established. When a record is cataloged,

that marked record will be translated into mods, and then that mods record will be used to enhance the existing mods record associated with that package.

And throughout the life cycle of a piece of content, it's accessorized with more metadata through preservation processes, maintenance and enrichment.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Lisa who'll talk a little bit more about access.

LISA LaPLANT: Hello. My name is Lisa LaPlant, and I'm a program planner on the access and delivery team. I've been with GPO for a little over six years and have been on the FDsys team for three years.

So at its most basic level, access and delivery provides access to content and metadata, sorting the system, and provides a process for the delivery of content and metadata to users in formats that meet their needs.

One year ago at the spring counsel meeting in Seattle, we provided -- gave a presentation on a day in the life of FDsys. Since then, we've further defined and refined our scenarios that we presented there and translated those into basic user interfaces that provide access to 1-B system functionality. This presentation will be an overview of 1-B goals and

objectives. It'll show how 1-C will build upon 1-B and highlight prototype 1-B user interfaces to demonstrate key system functionality.

So the goal of 1-B and user access and delivery is to provide a foundation for building improved access to publications within scope of GPO's dissemination programs.

We are laying the foundation and building the plumbing for the system in terms of access and delivery. So some of the components that we're working on right now are CMS, or content management system and our search engine. So as Mike mentioned, some of the development activities related to 1-B really focus around getting those systems in place and configuring them.

So our key objectives for 1-B include providing a single, simple search box and advanced results, parsing metadata elements and providing for pilot collections, and that includes also parsing mods records and using those parsed elements to create searchable navigators and really start through the process of an enhanced search.

We utilize content packages to provide access to content and metadata from a single user interface. So you'll be able to get your mods records and your

content in one interface.

And then developing basic user interface is focused on functionality that'll provide a springboard for the development of my key interfaces and facilitate community discussion as we continue in the development process.

So building upon 1-B, release 1-C, access and delivery, will provide features necessary to subsume and enhance GPO access application functionality. We will provide an advanced search which will entail a fielded search. We will provide dynamic browse so the capability to dynamically drill down into collections, full ILS integrations so you'll be able to access bibliographic information from the ILS, granularity meaning the content is delivered to users at a level of granularity that's less than what's available at a level submitted by a content originator. So, for example, if the Federal Register is submitted as an entire volume, you'll be able to access information at the article level.

Content relationships provide the ability to easily navigate relationships between the content within a package and across content packages.

Content transformation: So the ability to transform content into formats that are optimized for

delivery. So, for example, if we received tiff files,
we'll be able to transform those into PDF, screen-
optimized PDF, or print-optimized PDF formats so you
can usually access them.

And finally robust user interfaces. The one
thing user interfaces are a key building block that'll
be used to design and develop 1-C interfaces, and the
following slides illustrate 1-B features.

Okay, I know this a bit hard to see, so I'm
going to try and walk us through these. Okay. So for
our first slide, we see it's a FDsys search results and
for this slide, a user has entered a search for bio-
based items. So they put in a keyword search. You'll
notice that it's a search across multiple collections.
So for 1-B, you put in the search. You receive your
search results, and there is a box after the search
results that provides the ability to sort results by
relevance, resource, date issued and alphabetically by
title. You also notice on the search results that we
provide metadata associated with each one. So, for
instance, on the first result, you have the resource
that it came from, which is the Federal Register,
Volume 71; that it's in the rules and regulations
section and the page number that it's on. We also have
the information about the date it was issued, the

agency it came from.

The second and third result also contain the resource and date issued, but then have more publication specific information such as the version of the bill or on third results, the publisher of the information. So we're really focused on trying to provide a minimum amount of information on the search result and about the publication including some publication specific metadata. We also have links to a access version of the information. So you could click on view PDF and immediately pull up the PDF from the search results.

Okay. The next slide is a sort of the results on resource. This organizes the search results into specific resource-based collections. So, for instance, the first results is under Federal Register, the second one is under congressional bills and the third one is under agency publications.

You'll notice on this page that we have the appearance of our first navigator. And what we're calling navigators are elements that are part of a search that'll help users drill down into their search results.

So one of our key objectives for 1-B was to provide a simple search with advanced results. So on

this screen we have the ability to narrow by resource.
It provides the resources listed are Federal Register,
congressional bills, agency publications and tells the
number of resources under each one.

So if click on Federal Register, you see that
more navigators appear. And what we're actually doing
is instead of sorting the results or reorganizing them,
we're filtering out the results that are only available
for the Federal Register. And when we do this, we
provide additional navigators on the right that allow
users to narrow by agency, narrow by subagency, narrow
by section, narrow by date issue and narrow by page
range. So this really illustrates how once we find a
collection or resource that you're interested in, we
provide the ability to have specific navigators to
drill down to really allow users to find the
information they're looking for.

We also are using a technique of breadcrumbs
near the top so you'll be able to step back for your
search results. So near the top above Federal
Register, we have results for bio-based items in
Federal Register in final rules and regulations and a
specific page number. So all of these would be hot so
that you could step back through your search results
and back out of your drill down.

Okay. So we take one more step into our
search, and we click on the title. Okay. Now this
brings up what we're calling our content detail page.
This is really the page where we're providing access to
both the content and the metadata from the single
search screen. So on this screen we have both
publication-specific metadata, so information about the
Federal Register, the date it was issued, the agency
and subagency of the specific article, have the page
number range. And then we also pull out information
from the mods record. So we have the information about
publisher, language, it's a digital origin, that it's
born digital.

And near the bottom we have a way to download
both the content and metadata as a package, and that
would be as a zip file, and also the ability to
download content and metadata individually. So you
could click on PDF and download the PDF. You could
click on mods and download the mods file, or I guess
I'd click on zip, and that would download everything
that we have in the system on that publication
together.

So, this presentation has been a springboard
to really continue and further the discussion about
user interfaces and really be fine, as Mike said, you

know, you can go so far with collecting requirements,
but we really want to continue the dialog with the
community and really make sure that we're delivering
the functions of the system in a way that meets your
needs.

So we welcome any questions and comments and
any feedback you have. And you can always get in touch
with us at the BMO@GPO.gov or at our website. And just
you remember where we are.

Here's the more fun one. We'll take those
off.

Thank you.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: But you weren't in it,
Mike.

Questions from council?

PETER HEMPHILL: Hi, this is Peter Hemphill
of Hemphill and Associates.

A couple of things -- having built systems
like this before, there is a biggest concern of being
able to find what you're looking for more than anything
else in the search, spending appropriate amounts of
time on doing that.

One thing I've found, and I don't know if GPO
has considered this, the ability of GPO to attach
synonyms or aliases to documents based on feedback

coming back on what's not found, what hasn't met the needs of the end user or the patron.

The other thing is training and essentially, if you will, marketing of the system. You can have the greatest technology in the world, but unless you can sell it and have them use it, you just have another system, another very expensive system.

And I found when collecting this information from various sources that a training video or tutorial might be helpful for people using those screens that can be somewhat complicated and overwhelming initially in submitting information, providing them some forum to get some training and help them along would be very beneficial.

Thank you.

LISA LaPLANT: To address the -- this is Lisa LaPlant. To address the comment on the synonym and the aliases, that's definitely something that we're looking into, and that's a capability of our technology that we've selected for our search engine for 1-B. We are currently developing with the fast search engine, and that's definitely something that we can do and something that we see the value in.

MIKE WASH: And training, Selene, do you maybe want to address that one?

SELENE DALECKY: Hello. This is Selene
Dalecky. We do have a number of plans in the works for
training. We do have help from the contractor's side,
and we have people in the program management office
that are taking the lead on that, both for the 1-B
internal pilot, as well as for the public relations 1-
C.

And I think you're right. There's a couple
of different layers to it, because the interactions are
going to different. And in terms of search, you know,
our goal is to make it easier to use than the current
system. So, we want to make sure that we have a lot of
online assistance, tutorials, context-specific help,
things that people are used to seeing now in the online
environment. And then when you look at the internal
users or the external users who are submitting
information like the content originators, we're going
to need more in-depth training, system training, hands
on training, to make sure that when we launch, it's
useable, people know what to do and that we don't have
any kind of situation where, you know, there's the
initial launch, people are excited about it, want to
use it, but without the proper training, kind of the
interest dies down. And so we want to make sure that
we don't have that happen. And we're starting now to

work toward a training program that will make the launch successful.

PETER HEMPHILL: Just one other point with regard to the searching, is there going to be a capability to mine information from users as to what they -- what they put in and whether they click on something to know that they got what they were looking for?

LISA LaPLANT: We will have the capability -- this is Lisa LaPlant. We will have the capability for enhanced metrics within our federal laws and the guidelines and standards, so that will be a capability to provide, you know, the reporting features and information like that.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina Stierholz.

I have a question. I noticed in 1-B, you guys are focused on content submission, these agencies actually depositing the material. And then 1-C it looks like you're considering more of the web harvesting element and that you're going to look at getting your material that way.

How much work did you guys do with the web harvesting pilot and how much is that going to integrate with what your planning on doing?

MATT LANDGRAF: Yeah, that's a good question. This is Matt Landgraf. Sorry, I forgot to mention my name there first.

But I was actually -- I work in the program management office working on FDsys, but I was also the program manager for the web harvesting pilot. And we focused a lot during that pilot to sort of map those requirements and really what we were doing to functionality into the sort of the feature state of harvesting tools that will be implemented with FDsys. Those tools are currently scheduled to be implemented in conjunction with FDsys in release 2 of FDsys, but, you know, the system is actually going to have the capability to accept all three types of content for release 1-C through any kind of harvesting activities that go on between now and release 2 of the system, as well as converted content.

So, just to sum up, there's a very close alignment between sort of the harvesting pilot activities that we're doing now and mapping that to the future requirements [indecipherable].

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Any other questions from counsel? Okay.

Questions from the audience? I remind you if you come to the microphone, state your name and again

so that the court reporter can get your name. And I'll open questions up to the audience.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

And I'm asking this from a really technologically idiot standpoint, but Ric had mentioned that FDsys was going toward handles as opposed to Purls, and I don't understand enough about this to know how does that relate to open URL? Does it -- could somebody explain that to me?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Selene, could it be?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: It wasn't in the picture either was it?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: No, it wasn't.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hi, I'm Gil Baldwin with the PMO, program management office.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: We can't hear you.

GIL BALDWIN: Okay, let me work on that. Can you hear this?

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Yes.

GIL BALDWIN: I'm Gil Baldwin, PMO, program management office.

Open URL's is considerably a more granular application than what we are initially talking about. Although we think the handles will support that if we

get to that point in the future. So there is a future
state requirement to support open URL's and that's been
in our requirement set all along. So we believe
handles will support that.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm Kim Ricker. I'm
the GIS data librarian at the University of Maryland.
I just have a question about how FEDS and FDsys deals
with publications with associated geo reference data,
whether -- how it's taken into account with the
metadata, whether you use FTDC standards, how searching
is done, whether it's by co-ordinance, et cetera, and
about downloading.

KATE ZWAARD: 1-B isn't really designed to --
I'm sorry, I'm Kate Zwaard -- isn't really designed for
geo-spacial data. That's something that we'll be
looking at in future releases. So that the geo-spacial
data, specific metadata, isn't one of the extensions
schemas that we're using right now, but it's something
we'll look up.

KIM RICKER: Which go for the future?

KATE ZWAARD: Uh huh.

KIM RICKER: Great, thank you.

LISA LaPLANT: And actually -- this is Lisa
LaPlant. One other thing to add on that is in keeping
the theme of partnerships as we're going forward,

that's something that we would definitely like to have input in, and work with the community on the best way to present geo-spacial information to make it the most useful for you and your patrons. So we definitely would love to work with the community on that.

ANN MILLER: I'd just like to suggest that maybe you should get in touch with CUAC, cardiographic users advisory council, which usually meets in D.C. in the spring. They are usually representatives from all across the geo-spacial user groups, including usually someone who has some sort of affiliation with depositories. But in my mind, they're often the experts in library land for that sort of thing.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: They're meeting in Reston not this week but next week on Thursday and Friday.

KIM RICKER: Excellent, thank you.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Other questions from the audience? Council?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: My name is Kathleen Amen. I'm from St. Mary's University in San Antonio.

I hope this isn't a really stupid question. If it's something I should know, you can slap my hand.

Could you talk about the relationship of the CGP and the FDsys? It seems sort of like the search results -- I mean I like the way you've done it, it's

great -- but how -- what do you see us eventually
doing? Using the CGP or FDsys or a combination of the
two? Could you just maybe talk about that a little
bit?

KATE ZWAARD: This is Kate Zwaard. Right now
you can search -- well, when FDsys is released, you'll
be able to search for content through the CGP or
through FDsys. But we do anticipate more robust ILS
integration as we go forward so that there should be at
some point one single interface for access.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: My name is Mary Martin.
I'm from the libraries at Claremont College in
Claremont, California.

One of the things that's going on in my
library right now is we are reallocating space. We're
reallocating the complete configuration of our library,
our users, our collections, and we are being asked to
tell our administrators on our campuses what we want to
do with our depository library collection. So, you
know, as I look at this, and I'm very impressed by the
capabilities that this system promises to users of
government information. But the question in mind is
I'm just wondering where libraries come into this,
because I would anticipate my administrators, you know,
if they saw something like this, and not just the

administrators, but our digital librarian, our systems
people, the people that I would be asking to consider
our capturing electronic documents and keeping them in
our library, they're going to say, "Why? Why would you
even need to do that? If you have this system, why
would you even need a depository library? Why would
you need to deposit anything at all? All you need to
do is go there and look at the document."

So what I'm asking council to do is to help
us come up with the explanation of why we should be
depository libraries and exactly what this system --
what meaning this system has for the depository library
of the future? Why do I tell them when they say, "How
much space do you need for your depository? What kind
of services do you need? What kind of server do you
need? What does this system mean for the depository
library future?"

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: That's a good question.
That's one that we've been wrestling with. I think the
community needs to continue to wrestle with that over
the next few years. I think it's a nice challenge that
we have a system that will -- that we're working
towards a system that will provide such good access.

So I think that's one of the reasons we're
here for. Good question, Mary. Thank you.

RIC DAVIS: This is Ric Davis from GPO. If I
could add to that, I think that in keeping with this
partnership theme, I think a further discussion that
we're going to have during conference is the FDsys is
going to provide access level information using the
access package that was talked about. We're also going
to archive this information. But part of the
discussion as well is what is the role of the library
in the future in terms of potentially having access
files to make available, and also the discussion about
digital deposit.

I think the capabilities that FDsys has
enables us to employ technologies that would enable
those types of things in terms of libraries filling a
role in partnership with GPO. And I think we need to
have dialog and as part of what some of these other
sessions are about to help define that role, but I
think we have technology enablement that will allow us
to do those types of things.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Jeff?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: This obviously isn't an
answer to the question because that is the question,
but something I saw in today's presentation really made
me very happy, and that's the one search box, the
parsing of it, the navigators. In that interface,

there is a place for librarians, because those

navigators can also link you to expertise and could

push through the user back out to the community if

expertise is needed in a certain area. So I see that

way of doing things opens some possibilities which gets

it some of this question.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Mary Alice?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Mary Alice Bausch,

American Association of Law Libraries.

Just going back to the ideal I think that

entities in all three branches will deposit their

electronic files with you, clearly GPO historically is

the publisher for Congress, so I don't think we have to

worry too much about congressional information for the

Supreme Court, but there are other federal courts who

have not been involved in the FDLP historically, and a

couple of agencies at different levels of compliance

with JPL mandates for publishing.

Could you tell us, Mike, how successfully

you've been in outreach with the administrative office

of the courts and would some of these agencies who

historically have not participated in the program,

because, again, ideally we want them all to deposit the

files with you, and I suspect working with OMB would be

a big positive move, and I'm wondering if you've had

discussions with them and how supportive they might be of this project? Thank you.

MIKE WASH: I think we've been somewhat successful with outreach to that community. We need to do more, I believe, in that the whole area with the legal community and the courts, there's the issue of technology, of helping to understand that there are technical solutions to help authenticate and demonstrate that publications are unaltered. But there's also the acceptance factor from that community to be able to accept that form of authentication.

We recently had a briefing session that Carrie facilitated that I thought was very good. It was at GPO, and I think that too is a starting point, because from that, we need to get more and more involvement.

For the OMB side, we've worked closely with OMB over the past couple of years in providing some briefings to them. Because within OMB, they have the federal enterprise architecture type of approach that they're looking to make sure that all the agencies can inter-operate and communicate, therefore, with each other. And as a result, there's some standards that have been put in place or tried to be put in place so that agencies can start to align to that.

And Dick Furth, who is the architect over at
OMB, he's very keen on FDsys, and he's been watching it
closely and seeing what we've been doing with our
modeled approach for information systems with our WAIS
where we're not really reinventing wheels. We're using
well developed and embraced standards and reference
models. And he's been citing what we're doing at GPO
as an agency type of best practice. So he's been
pointing to us, which is very exciting. So I think we
are doing a lot of things that are being recognized
within OMB. We still have some additional things to do
with outreach to allow us to really get out there and
help people understand that there are technical
solutions and help them and understand that there's
other issues that may be goes back to training and
understanding to help with overall acceptance of it.

But I hope that answers the question, Mary
Alice.

ANN MILLER: Ann Miller. Just following up
on that, because I think that's a really good point.
Only one thing I'm wondering and that I want to make
sure is very robust in this system is the ability to
call in and acquire information without agencies coming
in and depositing it or having to make the intentional
deposit, because I think agencies are looking for a way

to do this with the least amount of work. And if
there's a way that we can automatically get things that
they're putting upon their web page, then we've taken
one step out for them and we've taken one step out for
us. So willy-nilly, whether they want it or not, we
get it and that's I think the ideal in the long run.
Because if they keep -- if we keep telling them you
have to fill out this form, you have to go to this
place, you have to, you know, make these things, then
we're going to continue to have the, you know, escaped
documents problem.

MIKE WASH: And this is Mike Wash.

There's some really great things I think
going on. There's the interagency working group that
Matt is a part of and others that is helping in an
outreach with agencies for them to tell us what would
make their life easier. And even during those
sessions, it's really clear that many agencies don't
realize how difficult it's been for us to be able to
survive in this world of self-publishing of information
on the websites. They don't realize how difficult that
has made things for us. But maybe Matt can speak a
little bit to that in a second.

But we're also -- we continue to be a strong
advocate for a roundtable among not only OMB for this

inter-operability, but we meet with MST, the Library of
Congress and the national archives talking about inter-
operability of information so that ultimately you can
just imagine a time where there's going to be a de
facto type of standard for how packages should appear
so that things can flow very readily and easily
between, you know, government agencies, not just the
publishing agencies, but maybe Matt in a few minutes on
-- or just a few words maybe on those. Yeah, 20 or 30
minutes would probably do it on ICBCS.

MATT LANDGRAF: This is Matt Landgraf.

Thank you for the opportunity to bring this
up. It's actually something I unintentionally left out
of my presentation is that we have done a good amount
of outreach with some of our federal agency publishers
and with Congress as well. Mike mentioned the
interagency council for digital content submission.

We've shown a couple of iterations of the
graphic user interfaces that you saw with them, and
they've actually, you know, given us a lot of great
feedback on some of the way things can be improved.
And, you know, it was a message that came through sort
of loud and clear is really, you know, not really
making the process better, making it easier for content
originators to interact with GPO and not necessarily

just mimicking the current process. So we sort of had
that sort of thing in mind throughout all of our
outreach.

We've also had good meetings as well with one
of our graphic user interfaces with members of, you
know, the secretary of the Senate and the clerk of the
House and so we've really worked to sort of bridge that
gap. So I completely agree, you know, we don't
necessarily want it to be a system that, you know, that
creates work or is just as much work for our agency
customers.

ANN MILLER: This is Ann again. I think GPO
needs to be like a buffer. You know, everything is
perfect, everything gets done, but you hardly notice
that they're there.

And I mean I think of the Google model where,
you know, Google is crawling everywhere. And you do a
search, you pull it up, I don't know -- well we know
how much Google is hitting to each site, because we
track that sort of thing. But that might be similar
kind of thing where, you know, agencies don't know how
much GPO is interacting with their information unless
they check their log. That to me is for them -- it's
low cost for them. It's automated for us, and we get
the information.

SELENE DALECKY: This is Selene Dalecky again. I just wanted to add to that a little bit.

We have been talking to a lot of the agency publishers and printing officers through out different councils, but we haven't only just been talking to that one group, because we know that there's different gatekeepers of information with an agency. So, we have been going out to the [inaudible] webmaster's group and to the federal webmaster's group and to the people who own the information from the electronic distribution side so that, as Ann said, we can find a way. If we don't get this information deposited directly with GPO, then we can make it easier to go and pull this information from where these various agencies keep their information available to the public online.

So there are a couple of different avenues that we're looking at so that we don't just focus all of our energy on one area.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Anymore questions?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Marcia Meister, University of California at Davis.

I'm not sure this is really a question. It's more of a comment and followup on the outreach to agencies, and that's just a particular concern about reaching the regional offices of federal government

agencies and educating them in getting those

publications into this stream too. Because during this

sort of transition period that we're in, those are the

publications that I see falling through the cracks.

You know, by their own proclamation, the U.S. Corps of

Engineers, particularly -- well, I say particularly in

the west, but that's probably not true, but what I see

in my area are really important environmental

documents, documents done by Army Corps of Engineers on

levy repair systems in the Sacramento Valley area in

California. These are done at the regional level, and

it's so hard to get these things and to get out there

and feed these items into the mainstream of the FDsys

is just something I encourage you to work on.

RICHARD AKEROYD: This is Richard Akeroyd.

That comment takes me back in my mind to the

earlier question about the future of the FDLP. And I

have a feeling that obviously we're in some kind of a

transitional stage here. All the vision for the FDsys

is not going to be here 100 percent populated by

tomorrow or the next day or even the next couple of

decades probably in terms of long-term planning. But

it does seem to me -- and focusing on something that

happened with us in New Mexico when we started our

digital archive project, which was a project to catalog

and make accessible born digital state documents. We
very quickly moved from the state documents' emphasis
to capturing New Mexico and southwest fugitive
documents of the kinds that the last comment just
focused on.

And I think as we think about the future of
the FDLP, we ought reflect back on Peter Young's
comments yesterday about seeing us more playing roles
of interpreters and integrators. Yes, we're going to
store a lot of documents for a long time, but we're
also going to be dealing more with online
documentation. And I think we need to look focusing on
regional and state-level activity as we're going
through this transition. And I think there's a lot of
implications there for building planning, space
planning and everything else.

So, I'm not offering this as an answering,
but more as a conceptual way of thinking about what
we're going to be doing in the future and the
opportunities that FDsys and other kinds of projects
that we're working on give us as we think about that
future.

PETER HEMPHILL: Richard, I certainly concur
with you. This is Peter Hemphill.

I've been thinking about the whole situation

of FDsys and what some of the most powerful computer systems in the world do. And lot of the most powerful ones aggregate information from various sources throughout areas and allow people to find them -- find the information they're looking for.

And the way I kind of see FDsys evolving is various certified places throughout the United States have authentication credentials for certain documents. They're then integrated into FDsys as a federated type system where these regional documents could be captured by perhaps you all that are authenticated sources going into FDsys that would allow searching across those authenticated sources of information to be able to pull back these results.

Now that could become very powerful in that you have representatives in all parts of the United States and potentially the world feeding information that's through authenticated sources. You know what level of credentialing they have, so you can determine the source and take that into consideration when you're looking at the document.

So I would kind of see that as how FDsys would evolve, but that's just my thinking.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Stan?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [indecipherable] at Penn

State. My question is sort of related to an earlier

question that talked about a relationship between the

catalog of U.S. government publications and this FDsys.

It seems to me that one of the dangers that you can

fall into in creating this system is recreating the

wheel. And, you know, there's harvesting of the

documents itself, but something you need to think about

is the harvesting of metadata, because many of us are

cataloging these sites or cataloging electronic

publications, you know, whether or not you're

harvesting that metadata through, you know,

interactions with OCLC or something like that.

But my question was it was sort of

overwhelming when you're talking about 200,000

documents that came out of that harvesting project. My

question is is how many of those 200,000 already have

metadata?

And then my last comment that I want to leave

you with because I would be remiss in saying in your

next versions, one of the things you need to think

about is numeric data, as well as geo-spacial data, and

I would encourage you to look into the DDI alliance so

you're looking at metadata standards for numeric data.

MATT LANDGRAF: This is Matt Landgraf.

I'll first address the question about the

harvesting content from the pilot. I agree that harvesting of metadata needs to be a really key part of what we do with harvesting. And we actually did build some of that into the pilot, but we required them to harvest all metadata that they find with the site.

I encourage you actually, because we could probably have a 45-minute conversation on just this, but there is a session tomorrow on web harvesting that we can start to tackle some of those issues.

And I guess, Kate, I don't know if you have anything? Okay. Thank you.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Any other questions from council? Okay. Thank you very much.

I do want to remind you that there is a lot of regionals and groups getting together for lunch. I do have a note that was handed to me that there's a selective from Maryland who is looking for their regional. Cindy Todd, to you want to jump up, wave your hand? There's Cindy over there.

So find your regional. If you're, you know, Cindy's covers D.C., Maryland and Delaware.

So otherwise see you all back here at 1:30. Have a nice lunch.

   (Off the record from 11:58 a.m. to 1:37 p.m.)

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Again, before we start with

this session, I just want to give you a reminder that council will be having a working session from 3:30 to 5:00 in the Aspen Room. My apologies, it is very small, but we decided last night we wanted to have a working session having to do with some recommendations that we want to work on. So after the break, if you want to stick your head, as I said, it's a small room, but we're going to try to get some work done.

And I'd like start with this afternoon's presentation on electronic services. And I believe the first speaker for GPO is going to be Linda Resler.

LINDA RESLER: Good afternoon. I'm still a little out of breath. I think it's -- I like to tell myself that it's the altitude, so we won't go there.

Thank you.

I'm Linda Resler. I work for Laurie Hall. Many of you may have heard her speak this morning. I'm the manager of library technical services support section. A lot of "S's" there. And I have primary responsibility for the integrated library system.

And what I wanted to talk a little bit about today was a federal -- the new library directory that we're working on. It's not live yet, so I can't really show you the live application, but I have a few screen shots just to give you an idea what it's going to look

like.

Okay. Let me see if I can figure this out now.

We're releasing these services. We have a suite of services that we're going to provide through catalog of U.S. government publications. That's for you folks that are new, -- sorry, let me catch my breath here -- for you folks that are new, it's the public phase, the OPAC of our integrated library system, the catalog of U.S. government publications, or CGP.

The first service that went live was the locate in the library functionality in the CGP, and that is -- that provides the link when you search the CGP, and you pull up a bibliographic record, you can link from the locate in the library field. It's the 856 field, not the Purl of the URL. It's 856 blank, blank, no indicator. For you catalogers out there, you click on the link and it takes to a form where the user can enter information to find a library who either has that particular publication or could provide perhaps some service in that subject area. So that's been live since the CGP went live in March of 2006.

The next thing we're working -- let me get a bit of water -- the altitude again -- the directory

administrative module. And then we also have a public

interface. We're going to retain the clickable map

that's currently on GPO access library directory. And

then we're also going to have some export features.

And we have our contractor working on this,

and we've given them a deadline and we hope to be able

to release these for this summer.

The library directory -- oh, let me slow down

a minute. The administrative module is going to allow

libraries to come in and edit or update your library

directory information yourselves without any

participation by GPO staff. And we've added some new

fields, and it'll be -- well, we're providing some

additional functionality from the one that's currently

-- well, the one that was available on GPO access.

Now here's my new features. You can edit

your directory information, and it will be in real

time. So, when you make your changes, you actually see

them reflected.

We also have -- if you've forgotten your

password, we'll use the FDLP internal passwords for

this. And the depository coordinator or whoever you

want in your library to be the point of contact, will

have a user name and a password. And so if you forget

your password, there's functionality in that you can

have it e-mailed to you as long as you're the contact
that's in the database.

So new fields that we put into the director,
there's a field for your catalog URL in addition to the
depository -- I'm sorry, the institution URL that's
currently there.

We've put in a field -- we've been talking
about partnerships, so a partner library. And we're
developing -- we're calling them dynamic fields, so if
you answer a certain way, then additional drop-down
menus will appear that you can fill out as much as
information as it pertains to your partnership.

Shared regional and selective housing sites
will also work the same. And we put in some new notes
fields. And those will be particularly useful for
providing us some information, library specific
information, and we also some notes fields that will
display to the public.

So, for example, if you're closing for the
summer or renovation or maybe fumigation, something to
that effect, you can put a note in the public note
field and your users will be able to see that.

This is not too exciting of a screen, but
this is the initial login screen. And I knew you would
all maybe be tired after lunch, I knew I'd keep you

busy by squinting at the screen going "What is that?
What does that say?" User name and your password --
it's not too fancy. You can see there's the lost
password you can click on and have your password sent
to you.

And here's the directory password retrieval.
I know these slides are exciting, but here's where --
that's the next form. As I said, this isn't live yet,
so I can't really show you the live application itself,
so I picked out some of these screen shots.

Once you log in, this will be the screen that
you get, the profile search. And the options, we've
set this up on levels of permission. So the depository
libraries will be able to do certain things based on
the permissions that we've given them. And the options
that you have will appear on the menu on the left hand
side.

Excuse me, I don't know why I'm nervous.

And you can enter in the fields or you can
use the drop-down boxes. And this is what the profile
actually looks like. Like I said, this is still in the
development, so if you see something that's, you know,
screamingly objectionable, feel free to give me your
comments. But this is what the profile looks like at
the displays when you searched and brought one up. And

to edit it, you click edit in the right hand corner and this is what it will look like.

The fields that you have permission to edit will be white, and the gray ones either will require higher privileges, probably for us, things that we would input that you really wouldn't want to change.

And here's the second half. That was a long screen. Here's the long half, and I wanted to show you the notes fields down at the bottom. There are free text. The library notes are for notes that you want to for yourself or for us, those won't display to the public. And the field that just says "notes," those will be the ones that will display to the public.

So like I said, if you had something that you wanted to make your patrons aware of, a change in hours maybe, something so simple as that, that's where you would put it. And they could actually see that information.

This isn't too exciting either. This is the screen where you can change your contact. If your coordinator is in the database is the contact, here you have the power to change that information yourself. You don't have to call us or e-mail at GPO. You can -- we trying to empower you to do some of this yourself, and here's where you can change the user details.

Help, there's going to be several kinds of
help. We haven't really written the text up yet, and
these are the areas that you will be able to click on
for some help in using the application.

This is for the public interface. We're
keeping the clickable map, that really nice clickable
map that's currently on GPO access. And you can -- the
same functionality click on this date or you can click
to find all regional. And here's the second part of
that.

You can do a basic search, basic keyword
search, or you can do an advanced search.

And when you click on one of the profiles,
here's what it looks like. Well, say we did a search,
I think this Washington, D.C., I did a search for the
depositories in Washington, D.C. And they appear in
the order in which they were input, but I hope you can
see each column has an up or down arrow so you can sort
all of those columns, either ascending or descending.
So that would be helpful, I hope, in how you get
information from these views when you do a broad
search.

And let me see, this is the -- it looks just
like the screen for when you go in as a -- when you
login as a depository to edit your profile. This is

the way right now we have it for the public. We've
taken a lot of fields out there that they probably
aren't going to want to see. And this is what it would
look like. As I said, this part is still under
development.

Steps to implementation -- I think Laurie
mentioned this morning there were handouts in your
folders that had some information about the director.

First of all, we're going to announce a
closeout date for the existing directory after which we
ask you not to make any changes to the existing
directory.

We're working on a data entry conventions
guide that we will provide you so you will know how to
input in the field, so we can have consistent
retrieval. And we also are going to do an Opal
presentation on how to use the application.

And then we are going to ask you to update
the directory, the new directory. At least look at
your depository directory information and make any
changes or maybe you might want to add your catalog
URL, and we'll give you a time frame. We think it'll
be about a month. And then it would up to us to deploy
the new directory.

And it's been mentioned about the FDLPL

having someone at your library subscribe, and this is where we will put out our announcement, so please do that if you haven't.

Any questions? I think I just -- I mentioned the handouts and the FDLPL announcements, and I put Laurie up here as the point of contact. She's also on the information sheet.

That was kind of fast and furious. Do you have any questions at all for me at this point or you just wait until we're ready to deploy?

Mr. Swindells?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Jeff Swindells, University of Missouri.

I have a very quick question. Currently, I know a number of us grab the directory data from the federal bulletin board and integrate it with other things. And, of course, the problem with that is keeping it updated and all that. Are you going to make your API accessible so that we can, heaven forbid, do mash-ups and things like that?

LINDA RESLER: Well, I -- I have an answer to that and actually it was in my notes, and I didn't cover it. Part of when the entire application is ready, you can have an export feature and txt, PDF or let's see, csv file formats. So that you will be able

to export whatever parts of that data you wanted. We
also on our side will be able to continue to put out a
directory that we feel that's necessary.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: But no direct hooks into
the data set itself? I mean it's more of the real time
access to the data that I'm interested in.

LINDA RESLER: I can't answer that right now.
I have to write that one down.

Anything else? All right.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hi. Amy West, University
of Minnesota.

I was wondering -- this looks really cool,
and I'm excited to see it, and so now having said that,
I'm going to ask for something additional. Are you
planning to be build in any alert services? For
example, if you have somebody's e-mail address for the
FEO list and the address goes bad, it would be really
handy for me as a regional to know, because our local
list doesn't always get a lot of traffic, and I might
not know for three or four months because selective
libraries like me forget to update or to remind
themselves to update, et cetera.

LINDA RESLER: Well, we've built in an alert
service for us internally, but we didn't at this point
-- haven't planned for an external one. Maybe we need

to take that one into consideration.

AMY WEST: For someone with limited ability to remember anything for any length of time, I would greatly appreciate it.

KATHY AMEN: Kathy Amen, from St. Mary's University in San Antonio.

I just had a question about the notes. I was trying to think about what might be a good thing to put there. Will it be possible to put a link there? I was thinking about maybe putting a link to our hours page, or is it just text?

LINDA RESLER: It's a free -- they are free text notes fields. I could take that back and check on that for you.

KATHY AMEN: Yeah, I just wondered about that.

LINDA RESLER: Because envisioned it more as notes rather than the requirement to link to a page.

KATHY AMEN: Okay, but I did have also just a small suggestion on that where you had library notes and then just notes. If you made the notes public notes, that would maybe call extra attention to the fact that those are going to be public notes.

LINDA RESLER: Yeah, I agree with you. It needs have a better description. Thank you.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina
Stierholz.

I'm wondering. You guys are creating a lot
of different directories and databases, things with
experts and I presume partnership one or something or
this library one. Are they going to all link together
somehow so that you don't have to update it in 12
places?

LINDA RESLER: You know I can only speak to
the ones that we're providing for the CGP, so I can't
really answer that, but I can take that back.

Anything else? Okay. Well, thank you for
your attention.

KAREN SIEGER: Let me make sure I'm still
connected here. Just a moment please. Okay.

Hello. My name is Karen Sieger. I am the
manager of web content and library services. I work
with Ted Priebe.

I wanted to see first if anybody wanted to
get an update on browse topics. That was one of the
other things that was put on our agenda. So you're
raising hands? Okay.

I have not been able to see what's up on the
screen. Is it showing up okay?

There's going to be a lot of emphasis on

being able to see these screens and the navigation with them, the text within them, so you may want to move up, but that's just a suggestion. I tried.

As partnerships is the theme for this conference, one of the partnerships that we have been working closely with lately has been a redesign of browse topics. It is a joint venture between Oklahoma State University and GPO. Barbara Miller and Suzanne Holcomb have been doing phenomenal work on getting this up and running with us.

We demonstrated this last fall at the conference. Since then, we have taken the feedback that we had gotten at that conference and gone through a little bit of a redesign from that redesign based off the survey and the comments we got at the open forum.

So what you can see here is -- I can't really see that well based on what you're seeing.

What we have done in the past what contributors would do is they would own a topic. In the spirit -- well, I'll get into it later on -- but web 2.0 with idea sharing and exchange is that people can come in here, create a profile and be able to go ahead and create new listings for a particular topic in real time. So they don't need to go ahead and submit the information to OSU. They don't need to know HTML.

You can go ahead and as if you were typing in any kind
of a, you know, office document, go ahead and put the
information in. And you can get as detailed as you
want. If you want to go ahead and put in blanks or you
want to put in graphics, you know, the sky's the limit
in that regard. So, you know, it really encouraged you
to go, you know, as in depth as you'd like with the
descriptions of the listings.

So if you look at our home page, what we
tried to do is take a look a browse topics as a feature
and see what we could do with regard to the categories.
Some of them will go outdated. They are based off the
subject bibliographies that haven't been looked at in a
long time. And working with OSU, we sat down and come
up with some new topic ideas and retired some other
ones. We did go ahead and contact the existing
contributors to make sure that if they had a topic that
we thought, you know, was a little outdated to see if
they could put input and say, "Oh, no, I really loved
doing this topic and I really think it's important, and
it needs to stay." So, you can take a look.

One of the -- what we did is we divided this
into 15 main categories, such as business and economy,
computers and internet, defense and military.

One of the new categories that have been

created is ID theft, as an example. So as you can take

a look, we -- since this was all created in a database,

we can interrelate the data very easily. As people add

sites, to browse topics, they have to go through a

review process at OSU before they are posted to the

web. Once they're posted, they're included in our

newest editions tab. And you can get a little snapshot

of the various listings in here, and they stay new for

about seven days.

        We also featured sites which are based off of

any kind of community events that are going on. For

example, if it's women's history month, we may feature

some of the sites that relate to women's history month.

We have most popular sites, which is based off a click

through rates. So somebody goes ahead and they see the

USDA listing, and they go ahead and they go ahead and

they click on URL from there, and we'll know what

people are going to the most.

        In this listing, in addition to getting the

computers more involved, we're able to get the public

involved. They can go ahead and recommend sites to

friends, which will send somebody an e-mail saying,

"Hey, you know, check out this site." They can go

ahead and print a listing off if they want to refer to

it later on.

If there's a bad link, God forbid, they can go ahead and report that so us, and they can also contact the owner. So if maybe there's a site that is missing, somebody can go ahead and say, "Hey, you may want to consider putting this in your listing." And the contributor can then log in, update the material, and it'll be reflected on the site.

I want to take a moment to thank Kathy Amen. She was our beta test user. She went through quite a bit to help us. And I believe solar energy was her topic.

What's that? Oh, wasn't that one of your? Which one was yours? Oh, languages. Okay.

So here are the entries that Kathy has put in so far. And she's helping us as we go through this and drive closer to a public release to really make sure that our how-to guides and our policies and descriptions are set so that as we add more contributors into the site, they'll have an easier time of updating their information.

So at this point, OSU has been contacting those that have expressed an interest in being a new contributor to browse topics. They've been adding them in groups of five or 10, so as they add them in, they're uncovering some more problems, little tweaks

here and there, and then we'll be opening up to more
and more people.

The time line for us going live with this
site is dependent upon the memorandum of understanding
being signed both GPO and OSU. At this point, it has
been reviewed by OSU and submitted to GPO, and GPO is
now reviewing it.

There is a working site search in here. You
can search across the entire site. You can also go
ahead and, you know, search within a particular
category.

There are these site tools which allow you to
change resolution based off of your browser. You can
also increase and decrease font, as needed.

So if you're a contributor, you would click
on our contributor's tab, and then you can log in with
your user name and password which is given to you by
OSU once they have entered you into the system as a
contributor.

And to date, as Ted mentioned in his speech
earlier today, we've had over 80 submissions into the
browse topic site.

Are there any questions about browse topics
before we move on to the FDLP Desktop? We have a few.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible] of becoming a

contributor, how long? I'm not sure I'm quite

following you. I had --

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: So in May I'll hear back

and so all I got back from GPO was the letter that said

"Okay, we'll get back in touch with you." So May is

the time frame to hear I would be considered as a

contributor for that; correct?

KAREN SIEGER: I'm sorry. The question was

how long does it for somebody to get back to you from

OSU once you apply to be a contributor? Okay.

That's very good question. As I mentioned,

Kathy was our beta user, and since then, OSU has been

adding in other users in a five or 10 user basis. What

they were doing was contacting each of the contributors

to see if they had time available now to start

inputting sites. If you haven't heard from them yet,

please contact Barbara or Suzanne. They are very eager

for people to start contributing to the site. And it's

just a matter of -- and they're trying to not open it

up too much at once so that they can work through any

bugs before really opening up to a larger audience.

So, generally they get back to you pretty

quickly to say thank you for, you know, expressing an

interest in being a contributor and, you know, this is

the step we're taking at the moment.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Julie Linden, Yale
University.

Will GPO be cataloging each topic the way
that there was cataloging for the subject
bibliographies?

KAREN SIEGER: I can't say that that question
has come yet. I can confer with Laurie afterwards, and
see what her take is on that and get back to you.

JULIE LINDEN: Okay, just a further comment
on that, and not necessarily that marked records would
be preferable, but just some kind of metadata I think
would increase visibility.

KAREN SIEGER: Okay. After the presentation
we'll talk.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Valerie Glenn, University
of Alabama.

And I may have missed this because I was
playing around on my laptop with the browse topics
site. But I did notice that when I started clicking on
some of the subcategories, there were no results
coming, so I just wanted -- like is it going to be
dynamic like once there are entries for the categories,
then and only then will they be clickable or will it be
that some people might be getting --

KAREN SIEGER: Well, right now, this is in a beta mode --

JULIE LINDEN: Sure.

KAREN SIEGER: -- and so, therefore, we do have empty categories to let potential contributors know what categories are out there. These are by no means limited to these categories either. If you have an idea for a new topic, please, you know, submit that to us.

As the sites are populated, they are added dynamically, but if there are not contributors for a particular topic, we will remove those listings from the public view and put that on your admin side to say, "Here are topics that need contributors."

JULIE LINDEN: Okay, just checking. Thank you.

KAREN SIEGER: Any other questions about browse topics? Okay.

And as you probably have noticed by now, I talk very fast. If I talk too fast, please raise your hand, and I will attempt to slow down. I can't guarantee I'll slow down for very long, but if you raise your hand, I will make a concerted effort.

Okay, so you all now have the Desktop up on your screen I believe? Okay.

Okay, so the last redesign of the FDLP
Desktop took place over six years ago when the web was
still relatively young. There are a few emerging
standards designed and blended with a content, and
essentially you needed to know each GNL that Word
published to the web. In addition, the web was very
naive -- well, not very naive -- rather naive when it
came to privacy and security. But the web has been
evolving and maturing ever since. And a new generation
of web-based services have emerged. Popularly, these
have dubbed web 2.0. And these tools emphasize online
collaboration and sharing among users.

Today users can share ideas instantly through
social networking sites with these blogs and other
communication tools, with little or even no knowledge
of HTML or other web technologies such as CSS, Java
Script, XML, just to name a few. So the internet is no
longer a passing fad as many had speculated in the
early 1990's. Today, the internet is embedded into our
daily lives.

So how we leverage the social trends with the
government and more specifically how do we leverage
them with regard with the FDLP Desktop. The FDLP
community is quite unique and one that GPO has been
committed to serving for over 100 years. It is a vocal

and dedicated community that has relied on tools such

as e-mail and conferences such as this for its

communication amongst each other and with GPO.

In the past, GPO's use of the FDLP Desktop as

one for program dissemination with little interaction

with the community other than web-based forms and

surveys, and those were temperamental to say the least,

but all of that is about to change.

Changes in technology and more so what you

should expect from online resources along with the

unique nature of our users has allowed GPO to get a

jump start on creating a more robust FDLP Desktop. The

focus of the redesign has been in keeping with the

spirit of web 2.0, social interaction and idea sharing

in a real time, non-techy basis while leveraging

federal mandates and guidelines, web standards and

privacy and security.

The site is now data driven. The focus will

be toward making the FDLP Desktop your principal outlet

for any and all program, news and updates. With forms

separate from content, we can now push the data to you

in a variety of forms where you get to choose how you

want to receive the information, such as through the

website, RSS or e-mail.

Your time is valuable. We want to make sure

that you get the information you need easily and in a
timely manner.

So if you take a look here at the site, you
can get a quick glance at what we have here. The
site's content and structure are being scrutinized to
insure the information is up to date, relevant and
written for the web. In addition, we are looking to
revamp existing applications through careful analysis
of how this data is used in the community. There is a
great deal of content resident on the FDLP Desktop and
it will take us a good deal of time to migrate it from
the old Desktop to the new. Therefore, dual sites will
be maintained while they make this migration. All
content will migrate in one form or another. Once the
migration is complete, the old pages will be taken down
and archived at GPO.

So, one of the things I mentioned was the
restructured navigation of the site and structure of
the site. If you go across the top here, we now have
pull down menus that take you to various content. As
of right now most of these link to nothing. They are
dead. They are just absolutely dead. There is some
content that has been migrated over, but for the most
part we put this in here so you have an idea of what
would be in each of these categories.

And since the people didn't move to the front
of the room, I'll go ahead and read what these say.
We sat down and tried to come up with a redesign
navigation scheme. We tried to think about the various
things we were trying to communicate through website,
and we ended up calling these things buckets. So it
basically had a one-liner that described the bucket,
and then looked at all of the resources on the Desktop
and tried to put in their appropriate bucket. And so
in the end we have these which are right now they were
set by GPO for the purposes of this demonstration, but
they are subject to change based on feedback from the
community.

Right now they are -- we have the home
button, then it says "depository administration,
manager collection, GPO cataloging, outreach and
education, council, about the FDLP and help."

Under Depository Administration, we have the
following subcategories. These are: assessment, basic
collection, best practices, bi-annual survey, for
collection, central titles, the handbook, the library
directory, newsletters, policies, procedures, regional
services and stay with the program.

Underneath Manager Collection, we have:
ANTS, the GPO bookstore, the documents data minor two,

the federal bulletin, the item listed, the item
selection, list of classes, lost docs, needs and
offers, Purls, shipping list, substitution list,
[indecipherable] classification, superceded list, web
claim and web-tech notes.

Under Cataloging, we have the national
bibliography, the catalog of government publications,
cataloging guidelines and GPO's ILS recommendation.

Under Education and Outreach, we have events,
FDLP-related training, library of the year, promote
your library and request for GPO participation.

Council right now has no subcategories. We
want to contact council to see exactly what they want
to do with those pages.

Under About the FDLP, we have: history of
the FDLP, legal mandate Title 44, superintendent of
documents, metrics, GPO projects, partnerships and
other GPO sites.

Underneath Health, we have: Ask GPO, the
file repository, glossary, knowledge base and site map.

So as you go through these, you also have the
ability to draw down into further submenus. So, for
example, underneath Promote Your Library, you can go to
things like GPO issued publisher materials. You've got
to order those. Or we have another one, for example,

high resolution images. That link does work.

When you actually get into the site, you'll
see that whatever tab you happen to be in is
highlighted in red. We also have your pathway at the
top so you can go back at any time to the area where
this content item happens to reside.

We have certain elements on the Desktop
homepage that I draw to your attention. What we tried
to do was bring together various news of the site so
that you have your main article.

We took a look to see how people read on the
web. And typically people ignore your header images.
What they start to do is they go for your primary news
article in this case, which is the 43 land grant
universities celebrate 100 years in the FDLP.

Once people see that, you know, they'll be
drawn to other images that, you know, move or things
like that. So that's what we have the rotating banner
on the top of the page that highlights various news
snippets that we may want to draw your attention to.
So, for example, the one that's coming up now happens
to be for the CGP, so we can go ahead and click on that
and actually get to the an article on the CGP or the
actual CGP application, wherever we choose to link to.

So here's one that happens to say the 20th

annual interagency depository seminar, and then you can go ahead and click on that and get to the registration form and be able to sign up for that conference.

So other stable elements of the FDLP Desktop on our right hand side, right now we have the survey list. This is not a permanent feature; only as surveys are added are they there at the moment. So right now we have a spring 2007 DLC evaluation form. So I encourage you that, you know, if you don't have time to fill in the sheet in your packets, then you can go to the website and fill out the survey right here. We also have one on the beta desktop, so please see how we go ahead and work on finishing the site really depends on what you want us to focus on. So please take the time to fill out the survey. It'll be up in about 30 days, so about the beginning of June it'll come down. It probably be replaced with a new survey at that point.

On the home page, we have the event countdown. This is for anything we want to draw your attention to.

Underneath Education and Outreach, we have our calendar. And one of the things we're looking to do in here is try to get more feedback from the community. So we have various categories in here. So,

for example, anything in red is a deadline. So we put

a couple of dummy things in here, but June 2nd happens

to be the deadline for the library of the year

nomination. So that'll be highlighted in red on the

calendar to give you an indication that that's coming

up this month.

We have another category for web-based

training, so any kind of Opal presentations that are

presented will be highlighted on the calendar to say

they are now available or we're going to go ahead and

do any kind of live training, we can put those on the

calendar as well.

We have one category for library events.

This happens to be national library week, so we've

highlighted that on the calendar.

We also have a section for FDLP conferences.

So that right now is highlighted on the calendar. But

at any time you can get to the calendar from our right

hand side. You also have the ability to search for CGP

from any page on the Desktop.

It is our plan that once the library

directory goes live that you'll have the ability to

search the library directory from any page similar to

the CGP.

So one of the things we've been hearing from

the community for some time is the inability to search the FDLP Desktop. Allow me to take the opportunity to show you our new search capability and, yes, it does not use WAIS. So it is available in the top right hand corner of every page, and we go ahead and type something in, and as we start to type, we can actually get live search results returns to us, so we can go ahead and choose an article from in here and I've put the keyword "land" in there. So any time that phrase or that stem appears, we can go ahead and it'll find it in our site search. So if we go ahead and hit enter, it'll take us to that article.

In addition, if we were to go ahead and do that search and just hit enter, we would actually go to a search results page, and then you can see in there if you go ahead and change your search a little bit and say I want to search all the words, any of the words, the exact phrase, I want to go ahead and rank them by the oldest first or the most popular, or the newest first, it'll also let you know what section any of the retrievals are available in. So, for example, on number five, we have 43 land grant universities celebrate 100 years. That's in the news, latest news category, and then it'll give you a little snippet to say now here's the little teaser before you decide to

click on the article and the date which it was written.
And we can click on any of these and go to the full
text article.

So it is actually looking within the text of
an article. It is also looking at metadata that we
have saved with each article, so both keywords and
descriptions.

Okay, so meanwhile, we are working to make
the FDLP Desktop an interactive medium for users
through their individual profile, unlocking tools. A
three year profile you can now publish and maintain
your own needs and offers list, for example. The site
will require the use of cookies in order to unlock
these tools. We do not share any personal information
that you choose not to divulge in your personal user
profile. And you will have the ability to choose what
fields are -- what fields other registered users will
be able to get to see such as by locking down elements
and only being able to show those through your buddy
list.

So, for example, I'm going to go ahead and
put this information in your handout which is in your
packet. There is a beta test user that's in here right
now. We have locked down registration for the site
until we're a little bit further along, but we have a

user of ahasse with the password of sudoc1. And if
you were to go in and login with this information -- I
also don't have the best internet connection right now,
so if the site seems slow, it's mainly that. We're
also -- we didn't get our new box yet. We'll have a
nice robust server this will be running on very
shortly.

So why don't you go ahead and you login up in
the top right hand corner. You'll actually have your
login information, so you can actually set a picture
with your profile. So there's a picture of Adelaide.
And there's also a private messaging system in here, so
you can go ahead and send messages to other registered
users on the site, and you can choose to opt in and out
of that feature. So if I were to click on photo, I
could actually go into the profile for Adelaide. Oh,
that's making a liar out of me. Okay. So here is
Adelaide's profile page.

So in here once we start to build more of
this, we'll have more information in here. It's also
based off of what the community would like to display
in here as well. So, for example, we could say what
state we're in. We can actually have the state flag.
We can go ahead and put in information such as our
library address, our e-mail address. If we use instant

messenger programs, we can go ahead and show those

connections. But you can also lock down what other

people will be able to see, so you can see that any

registered user would not be able to see this, but

somebody who has, you know, asked to be my buddy and

I've accepted them as my buddy, could then turn around

and see what my instant messenger login information is,

and they'll contact me by that route.

        If you're not registered for the site, you

cannot get to this profile information. So one of the

things is -- what I mentioned earlier is that we're

going through the content of the Desktop, we're trying

to actually take a critical at the data and see how

it's actually used by the community and be able to go

ahead create a more robust application for them so that

the data will interrelate.

        One example of one of the applications that

we did with that so far was in needs and offers. Right

now the people are sending those to Joe Packoski on my

staff and he's updating that. I've also seen needs and

offers listed on other list serves. This would

actually allow you to go ahead and put your needs an

offers into the system. You wouldn't have to know any

HTML. Just go ahead and fill in here's your name, your

address, phone number, here's a description, go ahead

and publish it.

So if you take on this one, if we go to our ads tab, here are the ads that -- I'm calling them ads, but their needs and offers -- that Adelaide has put in here so far. So, for example, if I took the outlook for U.S. agricultural exports, I could click on that one and see the details on that one.

Like I say, you know, it's free to a good home. The user has to pay the shipping. You know it's in excellent condition. I can put any kind of details I, you know, I feel are necessary with that listing. And I can also go ahead and update that at any time. So it's also got a -- just like the current site, has a 90-day window on it, but it's all automated. So from 90 days when you enter the ad or a vote, it'll go ahead and start the countdown on that one, and about seven days before it's set to expire, it'll send you an e-mail saying, you know, this ads going to expire; do you want to go ahead and renew it.

But this way you can go ahead and manage your own needs and offers. The e-mail addresses are not shown to the public. That's something you'd have to login to see, and that's part of our privacy and security. There are lot of e-mail scrubbers out there, spammers looking to scrub the site and flood e-mail

addresses and add you to their database. We're looking
to prevent that. That's one of the reasons why we're
looking for site registration.

One of the other things you can do in here is
that e-mailing somebody you can actually send a message
through that private messaging service and say, "This
is something that I'd like to get." How many times
have we lost, you know, e-mail due to the very bulk of
e-mails that come in during the day or, you know, those
on the spam list that you never actually get to see.
This would allow you to keep all those messages
internal to the site, so you have one place to organize
them.

Okay. Some of the other little features in
here is it's very hard to try to come up with a site
navigation that everybody likes. When we were going
through that in GPO, we were sitting there saying,
"Well, no, this should go into this category" or "no,
this is too far down; it should be its own tab." And
we sat down for many weeks and went through that.

One of the things that we've activated on the
site in a limited capacity is a system called My Links.
It's on the right hand side. It's only available once
you login. And what you can do is if you really want
to go to a page, let's say go back to the high rise

images page, and you say this is a page I use all the

time, and I don't want to digging on the site for it, I

can go ahead and -- oops, I managed to logout again --

it doesn't typically do that. I'm only on a good

connection at this point.

And once this logs back in, I going to ask

you to go ahead and bookmark this page, and it'll

appear every time I login to the site, and I can just

click on that link and go directly to that article. So

if you know that you're a library coordinator and you

have to complete the bi-annual survey that you can go

ahead and bookmark that so that you know that it's in

your watch list so to speak. Or if you know you use

needs and offers everyday, you can ahead and bookmark

that application and get to it easily.

So right now it's still in beta mainly

because you can add sites, but you can't delete at the

moment, so we'll be working on that.

Other things that you'll be able to do with

your site registration, you'll be able to register for

conferences, and this time you'll actually have a

reliable method for actually sending the information to

us.

In the past, you'll get a -- sometimes you'll

get a confirmation, but then you'll show up at the

registration desk and you say, you know, I registered

and your badge isn't there. Well, now you'll actually

get a confirmation from us saying that we received it.

All the information is now saved to a database whereas

in the past it was in an e-mail that went to GPO and

given the nature of the e-mails sometimes, they either

get lost or the CGI would stop working or things like

that. We also had a problem where spammers were taking

advantage of those CGI scripts and starting to send us

things en mass. So it started to get a little hard to

weed out what was a registration and what was spam.

But in addition, because of your user

profile, you will actually be able to go ahead and if

something comes up and you're unable to make a

conference, you can unregister for the conference. So,

for example, if you were to take a conference where

there was limited participation such as let's say the

interagency seminar was locked down to 90 registrants.

You can actually go ahead underneath advanced

registrations -- and my internet connection is flaking

out on me.

All right, so here's an example, we already

have the registration for the interagency seminar

built. It says the session date is July 22nd. I think

that actually might be wrong. I'll check that. So if

the registration deadline is the 30th of June, there

are 80 spots total and 80 are available at the moment.

So if you would go ahead and once this -- if the site -

- since it's now database driven, we can go ahead and

say on this date at this time we could turn this item

on, so and there's no forgetting. So come -- I think

this opens on June 1st.

Once this opens, you can go ahead and

register for the conference. As soon as you register,

it'll actually in real time decrease the number of

available slots. And then so if you come in and you

say there's one slot left, if you go ahead and

register, at that point, there'll be zero. Is anybody

else coming in, we'll say okay, there are no more

available spots. But if something happened and you

were unable to make it, you can go ahead and unregister

for it, and it'll automatically take that number and

increase it by one, open it back up again and somebody

else can take that spot.

I guess earlier registration is not required

to use the FDLP Desktop. However, some content will be

locked down to registered users or to registered

groups. So, for example, the bi-annual survey form,

the information on the bi-annual survey will be open to

the public, but if you wanted to go ahead and actually

fill out the survey, that is locked down to the
depository coordinators.

One of the other things that we're looking at
and making available, and we're still debating whether
or not this would be available to the public or
available only to registered users is to participate in
moderated chats with GPO staff. So, for example, you
know, we could say that -- and don't try this next
Tuesday -- but just say next Tuesday at 1:00 o'clock we
are going to have a moderated chat with the new acting
superintendent of documents. We can go ahead and start
open up the [indecipherable]. I just said don't go
looking to talk to Ric next Tuesday. We're not quite
ready to turn that on yet.

But there's much more potential that can be
unleashed FDLP Desktop and much of that depends on the
type of functionality that our community would like to
see and use. It also depends on GPO's policies
regarding usage, privacy and security which will need
to be developed.

Are there any questions?

SUSAN TULIS: Karen, this is Susan Tulis from
Southern Illinois.

The needs and offers part of that, is that
only accessible to registered depository librarians? I

mean the public would not be able to see what's on a needs and offers list; correct?

KAREN SIEGER: Right. In the current Desktop, it is available to the public, and the way that we set it up in the existing Desktop is that yes they can go ahead and view what's available in the needs and offers list. However, they would not be able to claim the information. That entire application, however, can be locked down to registered users if deemed necessary.

SUSAN TULIS: You might want to consider that. I mean I know we have -- we have issues in Illinois in terms of -- well, I don't know, I guess I would leave it up to the community as to whether or not that should be locked down.

KAREN SIEGER: Well if the --

SUSAN TULIS: I don't mind paying to ship a document to another depository library, but I'm not going to pay to ship it to an individual. And also, in my mind, that's still federal government property, and I'm not certain if sending it to an individual if we're legally allowed to do that.

KAREN SIEGER: That's an excellent note.

Another something that we can lock down, like I said, right now if you wanted to claim it, you would

have to be a registered member to claim the item, but locking it down to just registered users would not be very hard at all.

TIM BYRNE: Karen, Tim Byrne, University of Colorado.

I notice that there's a lot of acronyms used in here. And for the sake of the newer people coming to Desktop who don't speak pseudo yet, I encourage you not to use that many.

KAREN SIEGER: Yeah, that's very well taken. Are you talking about with regard to the navigation?

TIM BYRNE: Well, just throughout this [inaudible]

KAREN SIEGER: Okay. We'll definitely make note of that and take a look at that as well.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Yeah, can you -- can you repeat what he said.

KAREN SIEGER: Oh, I'm sorry.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I don't know what's happening on this side, but we cannot understand it.

KAREN SIEGER: What he said was he noticed that there were a lot of acronyms used on the site, and those who do not yet speak pseudo would not necessarily know what those mean.

Any other questions from council?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Amy West, University of Minnesota, [indecipherable].

I'm very happy to see the needs and offers application. One question that occurs to me though is that several years ago there was a discussion on the list and I had suggested a similar structure, and I got a lot push back from people who said I am not submitting 500 individual items, which is perfectly reasonable.

I'm wondering if there's going to be way for people to submit files if you're going to list what the structure is, so that they could give you a full set so that can be displayed at one time. That would also be relevant for us, because we don't have a good needs list, and we need to make one.

KAREN SIEGER: One of my staff actually mentioned something to that effect. He said that currently people have huge lists, so they're not going to necessarily want to go ahead and individually list them. I would encourage the individual listing, but I know that I'm probably going to lose out on that battle.

One of the things that he was doing was taking that full list and copying it and pasting it into the ad so that they were all listed, but when

you're saying, you know, can they submit a, you know,

standard file format that we would then ingest, we can

certainly look into adding that type of functionality.

AMY WEST: I think that would increase the

adoption substantially. I'm not sure how successful it

would be without that.

KAREN SIEGER: Okay, thank you.

ANN MILLER: Ann Miller, Duke.

That -- sorry, my brain has gone to sleep

too.

That leads me to ask, when you do a search,

would you pick up things from those lists or are you

going to have to scan through them all?

KAREN SIEGER: They are available in the

search.

ANN MILLER: Okay. Maybe you said that, and

I was asleep.

KAREN SIEGER: [inaudible]

ANN MILLER: Maybe you said that and I was

asleep.

KAREN SIEGER: Oh. I didn't -- I didn't

mention it, sorry.

ANN MILLER: Well, good.

KAREN SIEGER: The goal of the Desktop is so

that all the content of the desktop will be available

in that site search.

Underneath needs and offers itself, there is a search inherent within these offers so you can restrict your search to just that collection. But, yeah, -- but, yes, when using needs and offers and you add something, you will automatically be added into the site search.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: My comment, and you didn't talk about it -- I don't know if this is part of what you guys are doing, but amendments to selection which is going to be coming up again this summer, I want to let you know that page is still really problematic. Every time I try to submit something, I always get the error, and it takes quite a while to get anything to actually go through and get confirmation of that. So I was hoping maybe that was something could be worked on by this summer.

The other issue for me with that is when I have a lot of amendments or a lot of these selections which I have had, it would be much more easy if I could submit some sort of common delineated or Excel spreadsheet sort of thing with numbers rather than having to type things back all over again and perhaps making errors and mistakes that way when I already have an electronic file, there's no way for me to just

simply shove off that information. I have to recreate the list.

KAREN SIEGER: Those are all great ideas. I would encourage you -- we'll take the information back that you said, but I would also encourage you to fill out the survey form and let us know some of those details on the survey form, what content when we start to migrate into the new Desktop and when is going to be dependent, in part, on the comments we get back by this form. So it's not too lengthy of a form. I think it's only like eight questions. So hopefully you'll take the time to tell us what you think and let us know about added functionality that we could be looking into.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: My name is Sharon Parker, [inaudible] at Jefferson County Public Library here in Colorado.

I've noticed when I've looked at the needs and offers list, a lot of times there will be people who say they need something and then 20 lists down, they'll be someone who's offering that thing, and I always wonder if that person notices that their requested item is on a list. Is there some way to link those so that the person who did list it as a need would get notified when it was listed as an offer?

KAREN SIEGER: At present, no, but that's an excellent suggestion. One of the things I failed to mention earlier was we have devoted to create surveys on the fly through the system, and one of the things we're looking to do once this beta survey is underway is actually put out one specifically on needs and offers, so we'll take that comment back, and we'll see what other comments we get back from the community so we can make that a more robust application.

So just as a side note, the time line for going live, I don't exactly have one yet, because it's just really dependent on the feedback we get from the community. I will say that it will be released with shorter URL's. If you'll look up on the screen right now, you've got some long ones, but that'll all be fixed for the redesign.

It'll also be launched under a new domain, which I will not divulge yet. As soon as I say it, everybody's going to start hitting it everyday. So, you will no longer have to type in www.access.GPO.gov/su_doc/FDLP. It'll be much shorter.

PETER HEMPHILL: Hi, there. It's Peter Hemphill.

I'm mindful of the recommendation that council has outstanding with regard to a registry of

experts, and I was looking at your essentially a
registry there, and I don't know how close that would
be to what counsel would have in mind to be able to
select what information is made public to people about
the people that are in that sign-on area as to their
expertise and areas where they could be helpful and
whether they would be publically available or just
available through the library community. That's
something to consider.

KAREN SIEGER: Individual profiles, we have
that locked down, but that doesn't say that we can
create other applications within the Desktop that
utilizer that information to pull that out for a public
use.

ANN MILLER: This is Ann Miller.

It strikes me as we're missing an opportunity
here to connect this CGP library directories, the
browse topic expertise and the FDLP Desktop, and
there's a connection there of availability experts in
the community. And the fact that we have three
different places that you have to go to find these
things is not integrated and it's not very web too. So
I think that there really needs to be some next steps
to see how all of these things can come together rather
than well, you go here if you're trying to find stuff,

and people who may know something about solar energy.
You go here to find our local depository. And you go
here if you're a depository librarian and you're trying
to find some stuff on solar energy to fill in the gaps
in your collection. It needs to all be in one place.

KAREN SIEGER: We're trying to make the
Desktop for that one place for the FDLP community so we
can get to things like you can get to the browse topics
from there, but you can actually search in CGP from any
page. When you're actually talking about, you know,
can we create one database that contains all this
information and be able re-purpose that information; is
that more what you're referring to? That is something
that we can certainly look more into. I know that
Laurie and her team have been working in similar
platforms that the Desktop is being run on, and browse
topics and the Desktop are on the same platform, so we
could look interrelate that data more.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Barbie Selby, University
of Virginia.

I was curious. What is the platform?

KAREN SIEGER: What is the platform? Well,
we're running -- this is a -- we're basically running
off of my SQL and PHP for our front end and our back
end database. We are mainly using open source tools

that are well documented and well supported in the
community.

Any other questions?

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: No other questions from
council? Okay.

Well, we have a few extra minutes, but before
we take the break, there's a couple of reminders.

Again, council is going to have a working
session starting at 3:30. We'll be in the Aspen Room
if I remember that; right? All right.

Also, again, I want to remind you since
council won't be having a large session like this, and
there'll be other sessions, educational sessions going
on now.

I remind you of the reception tonight from
6:00 to 9:00 p.m. There is a flyer. Remember to take
your badge with you. Please come. A lot of people put
a lot of work in, and there's a lot of good partnership
and communities within Colorado coming together to put
this reception on. So we need show there's thanks --
show our thanks to them, but also show by being
supportive and attending the reception.

Tim?

TIM BYRNE: I would like especially to thank
Louise Treff-Gangler for the work that she did on that.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Okay, that's the end of our
session, and there will be -- there's a break and then
again 3:30 there's other opportunities, and if not,
I'll see you all tomorrow.

(The session concluded at 2:42 p.m.)

STATE OF COLORADO   )

) ss.   CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF DENVER   )

        I, Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter and

Notary Public within and for the State of Colorado,

certify that the foregoing is a correct transcription

from the digital recording of the proceedings in the

above-entitled matter.

    I further certify that I am neither counsel

for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties

to the action in which this hearing was taken, and

further that I am not financially or otherwise

interested in the outcome of the action.

        In witness whereof, I have affixed my

 signature and seal this 30th day of April, 2007.

 My commission expires August 16, 2010.

_____

    Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE

APRIL 17, 2007

_____

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Good morning.   And let's

have everybody start finding their seats, and we'll get

started in a couple of minutes.

I'd like to welcome you all here on this

cloudy, rainy morning.   And as we all know, it's

supposed to be sunny by the end of this afternoon.

But before we get started today, I do want to

-- I know there's a lot of things on your mind having

to do with the conference, but yesterday but another

thing on our mind, and I think I'd like to start today

by us having just a brief moment of silence about the

unfortunate and tragedy at Virginia Tech.

There's a lot of us on council who have

Virginia connections, and I know there's folks at GPO

that have Virginia connections, so let's just have a

brief moment of silence.

Thank you.   I'm sure we're going to be

hearing much more about this, good and bad, over the

next few days.

A couple of announcements, on the

registration desk there is a get well card for Robin

Haun-Mohamed, so that she knows we have not forgotten

her. And I'm sure she has not forgotten us. I haven't

gotten the daily update of e-mails from Ric, but I'm

not worried about that. I see the smile.

I want to thank again the folks that put

together the reception last night at the Colorado

History Museum. It was a wonderful event, lots of

food, and a really nice facility. I didn't get to see

it all; didn't have a chance to do all the exhibits.

The one that caught my eye was the Tenth Mountain

Division and that was a wonderful exhibit. So I want

to give those folks a round of applause.

Also on the bulletin board, you will notice

that there is a new pass code for the Wi-Fi.

Apparently there was a number in error yesterday, so if

you're having problems connecting to that, check that

you're using the newer pass code for that.

Again, a reminder when you come to the

microphone, both council when you speak and members of

the audience, please state your name and institution.

It helps since again we have a court reporter. He does

not know us all yet, but so please -- and also because

we're doing the recording, the pod cast.

And so let's get on with this morning's

session. We have a session on digital distribution,

and it will be led by Ted Priebe, director of library

planning and development, and Richard Akeroyd who is

the state librarian for the State of New Mexico

Library. And I believe Ted is going to start, and

they're going to be a tag team and I look forward to

the presentation.

TED PRIEBE: Thank you very much, Bill, and

good morning to everyone.

Just to give you a little background on

digital distribution and what we'll be doing today, I

will covering the introduction and some background and

delivering some assumptions that I would encourage

council to offer any feedback or thoughts on, and then

from there, we will move forward into some of the

issues and questions that we would like to get

additional input on.

This is the second council session that's

been conducted on digital distribution. And I'd like

to scope some of the thoughts at least as I framed them

that we are looking to validate some of the assumptions

about digital distribution in the future, and

specifically in the future with the future digital

system.

From that basis, we will be forming policies

within GPO and library services specifically. We will

be doing that in partnership with the community and

with guidance from our legislative side as well.

One of the key take-aways I'd like to put

right up front on this is that we are going to continue

to adhere to our mission of ready, free and permanent

public access. So what we have now, we will have in

the future. That will not change.

And can everybody read this okay? We had to

dim the lights, which is a great way to start at 8:30

session, especially on a rainy day. But I'd be happy

to read -- I'll try not to read everything verbatim,

but can you see it okay out there? Any responses?

Okay.

Well, the first part covers a lot of what we've talked about. The majority of the content made available through the FDLP's in electronic form, and that's why this is one of the key issues that we've had a lot of dialog within GPO as well with people in the community.

In talking in today's terms, libraries really do exercise that initiative of making that choice of pulling content from GPO access. They're under no obligations for access or attention, and I'd really like to use an analogy on this if I may, and it may be appropriate in the morning for those of you that went to the buffet table in the hotel that, you know, GPO

access today is much like when you go to the buffet
table, you look around, you decide what's relevant to
you, to your depository library, to your users, and you
take some of this and some of that. And you may choose
to use that or consume it or whatever the right term
would be. And then in many cases, you decide "well,
this isn't a value to me and I get rid of it." And
with FDsys moving forward, that same type of option
will be available to you. That won't change.

        With the development of GPO's digital content
system, we will continue to offer those services and
the options of downloading those files, and we may very
likely have much more enhanced options for you in terms
of the access files that you may be able to download or
request in that type of scenario. So it will actually
likely be an enhancement to services in what you have
today.

        We're here clearly to talk about the
consideration of the affirmative distribution that
authenticated an official published content to federal
depository libraries.

        And versus the full scenario that I was
talking about in terms of the buffet style and choosing
what you want and keeping what you want, we also have
this discussion of in the push where much like when you

call and ask for pizza to be delivered, you may a

conscious choice. Here's what I want, and I want "x"

amount of toppings or I want "x" amount of titles, and

that request comes to GPO, and those publications would

then be potentially disseminated through FDsys in that

type of scenario.

Talking about Title 44 today, just to

reaffirm which many of you already know, but in the

case of depository libraries, you're required to retain

in a capacity of at least five years for a selective

and for a regional permanently. So, that's something

we have to keep in mind without current Title 44, and

as we engage on this discussion, we can certainly look

at scenarios where our oversight will potentially look

at Title 44 and changes that may be made, but we do

need to look at things in terms of the now and what

FDsys can do and what Title 44 currently imposes on us.

The most relevant data that we have that I'd

like to share is related to the 2005 bi-annual survey.

I will put a caveat for the 2007 survey that we're

developing. We do have similar questions, and on top

of what I'm going to go over now, one of the action

items that we've talked about internally to validate

some of the discussion topics is we will likely be

coming back to you, our community, with a survey

specific on this topic, and in a much more detailed way so that we can validate and go forward with much more detailed requirements that we will need in that development of the FDsys and specifically in release two, which would be in mid-year 2008 that would have the capacity potentially for a digital distribution type of service.

So from the 2005 survey, what we had reaffirmed was basically one in five depositories did indicate that they took buffet style, if you will, downloading content and making it accessible via their servers in the their depositories.

One in three did indicate that they would be willing to receive digital files from GPO and to store them on their local systems. One of the key points though that did come from this survey is the majority of the libraries did express an interest in receiving a very small volume of files -- one to 25 files.

And I would assure you that in the validation that we'll do in the next wave of our survey, we're going to get a little bit more specific, so we have a much more definitive feel for what you, the community, want as we go forward.

I have just a few high level points from the October fall session on digital distribution that I was

also involved with, and that was from the session in
Washington, D.C., we did have validation that really
many in the audience or in that community of attendees
did express a definitive interest in having digital
distribution available as an option to them. So that's
one of the keys that brought us back here to get into
some more detailed assumptions and also some questions
that we'd like to validate with council, and hopefully
with time being with the audience as well.

Two of the big issues that came forward and
we're going to get into today, one being the issue who
owns those electronic files. And in the scenario of
you, a depository, making that conscious decision in
GPO access today, you pull it down, you know, it yours.
You keep it for whatever time frame you feel is
relevant for you.

And then the second scenario which is I guess
the more contentious one or one that we certainly will
talk a good bit about as well is the issue of what
requirements are placed on you as a depository in the
case of GPO pushing files and you receiving them. What
does that mean to you? What are the obligations as we
go forward?

It wouldn't be the government if we didn't
have definitions. In many ways in my job, I feel like

if there isn't a definition for a word, it really
doesn't exist, so this is somewhat of a lengthy one,
but in the scenario of pulling files, that is
downloading of content on an as-needed basis. The
contents are made available for the users to select and
then to retrieve or pull down to local servers or your
computers.

The GPO access is an example. Another
perhaps relevant one could be with the ILS as Laurie
had spoke about yesterday where you can make that
decision to e-mail yourself a group of records. And
again there are not retention or access requirements
that are associated with those files that are pulled
from GPO.

And the other definition I've got for you
today is on the push, and that is intentionally and
specifically serving out information to the targeted
recipients, in this case the depository libraries.
That content is automatically sent or pushed from GPO
to a list of interested users. This could be enabled
similar to our item selection today depending on, you
know, the final implementation of FDsys and what's the
most cohesive way for you, as users, to benefit from
that as well.

There's an analogy of this scenario much like

a shipping box that's sent to the depository libraries
as well with, of course, the difference being this is
electronic content instead of a tangible copy.

The protocols of how that happens the request
is given and the transaction originates with the
publisher or content server, and in this case we're
looking at GPO.

Under the assumptions -- and I would
encourage you to just stop me at any time or I'm going
to pause after each one and hopefully give council an
opportunity to share thoughts or opinions on these.
Electronic files of federal publications will continue
to be made available for downloading by federal
depository libraries under FDsys. I may hit this point
one too many times, but the validation is you will not
lose the ability that you have today moving forward
under no uncertain terms.

No comments on this one?

Number two, under an FDLP distribution
option, distributed digital files would be sent to
depository libraries via a push mechanism. So that
would be how this would be enabled in affirmative
distribution through GPO.

Richard?

RICHARD AKEROYD: This is Richard Akeroyd.

I'm a member of council and New Mexico State Library.

This probably will come up again in questions, at least I certainly hope it will from the audience, but is there going to be retention requirement with pushed documents as opposed to old documents?

TED PRIEBE: And at this point, the answer would be "yes," based on the current Title 44 requirements. But again I think that's one of the issues as we move forward and we engage with JCP and oversight what changes need to be made to Title 44. You know that's certainly an issue that very likely will come forward.

Number three, based on the most recent bi-annual survey, a high percentage of libraries do not want to receive electronic files at all. Those libraries that do wish to receive them want only a very small volume. And again that's based on the 2005 survey that we've got posted on the Desktop for more specific statistics.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Jeff Swindells, University of Missouri.

I think I agree with the assumption in general, but for instance, my institution has had to see change in its attitude toward digital distribution

based on events. We actually said "no," even though we
would have liked to because of some institutional
repository issues we were having. Those have all been
-- well, in the process of being fixed, so we changed
our mind. But I also think that in many ways we don't
know what libraries are going to opt into this because
they don't know what it means yet. They don't know
what we're asking for or what the requirements are
going to be. So I think that in many ways the
percentage of libraries that opt in and the number
files they elect to take is going to depend on
conversations which we haven't had yet.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth at
University of South Carolina.

The other thing is when you do go back out
and survey this, don't ask how many files. I would ask
how much space can your institution possibly dedicate -
- you know server space or whatever. And that's the
kind of conversation I have to have locally is what's
my space? What's the storage? What else do I need to
do this? It could be 10,000 files and the minimal
space it could be one file in everything.

TED PRIEBE: Richard, yes?

RICHARD AKEROYD: Following up on Jeff's
question or comment, I think he's absolutely right that

-- I'm sorry, Richard Akeroyd, member of council -- I think he's absolutely right that there's experience since the last survey. And based on some of your earlier slides or points, Ted, it seems to me that there is an experience base out there. Some libraries have started to take -- pull these things down and have indicated they want them. So your next survey you may want to include a section for those libraries that have started to pull them down and ask a little bit about what their experience has been, what their needs, you know, so that GPO can learn from their experience and feed that back to other libraries who are still asking the kinds of questions that you all just raised.

TED PRIEBE: Very good point. Let me see if I can summarize this just from the GPO side so I've got a good angle on maybe the path forward. So this suggestion perhaps from council may be initially to survey the community and specifically users that are currently downloading and storing and making accessible files, and then from them perhaps having a more global survey of users to validate or maybe reaffirm some of what we've got from our 2005 bi-annual survey to get a better assessment of the overall community.

RICHARD AKEROYD: It makes for a two-part survey maybe and a little bit more work, but I do think

that the ultimate results would -- from my point of view, the ultimate results would certainly be worth it.

TED PRIEBE: Okay.

DENISE STEPHENS: This is Denise Stephens from the University of Kansas.

I'm also curious about the metrics involved in that it may not be knowable or known by libraries at this time the amount of storage necessary, depending on experience thus far by GPO, it's just going to be issue process.

If I know that I need to have, you know, half a terabyte of storage or if I need to have 50 gigabytes of storage, I know that going into the deal, then it gives me a better indication of what I should plan for.

Also it might as a community inform us as to whether we should be pursuing individual library storing of some sort of shared [inaudible] storage as a way to get the information on demand without requiring individual libraries to over the management and cost of, you know, distributive storage. And I think that the metrics can perform a lot of this conversation.

TED PRIEBE: Denise had a very good point. I think from GPO's perspective, we do have some preliminary metrics which we have called system sizing information that we may be able to share and that may

help enlighten some of the issues of, you know, just what we're looking at in the depository. Because the last thing we want to do is make a big surprise with, you know, terabytes of storage where it really wasn't expected to be that based on the dissemination. So, very good, okay. All right.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne, University of Colorado.

I think if GPO had done similar surveys before they started distribution microfiche and CD-ROMS, they have gotten very similar results that there was not a great deal of interest. But there was interest and then once they started distributing, it grew within [inaudible].

TED PRIEBE: I think I've got the tread on this and its -- we've got some action items to go, but I think it's beneficial. Thank you for your input on this.

Assumption number four, redundancy is needed to insure future public access and FDsys will provide this capability either by storage at multiple sites, by relying on preservation partners or both mechanisms. And just right out of the gates on the inherent requirements on FDsys, although I'm not certainly the expert on it for preservation and storage, there are

requirements built in that would be inherent in the
system with having a redundant storage, not just a one
spot storing mechanism. But certainly our assumption
here is that it's not a one piece solution; that there
are many options that we could explore with input.

MARK SANDLER: Mark Sandler of CIC.

Teddy, I'm assuming that you're talking here
about digital masters -- depositing digital masters in
redundant repositories?

TED PRIEBE: As we scope the assumption,
yeah, it'll be talking about the preservation masters.

MARK SANDLER: And that would be different
than what we were talking about on the last item where
we're either pushing or pulling derivative files to the
-- to volunteer libraries, in a sense.

TED PRIEBE: Well, you know, I believe we
could probably have the discussion on both sides, and I
would be interested to hear opinions on both sides for
preservation as well as the access derivatives if you
will. I wouldn't constrain the discussion on either
path. I think it would be good input from everyone on
what we should do.

Okay. On the general assumptions, GPO will
distribute digital files that will be optimized for
public access. These files will typically be smaller

than the archival copies preserved by GPO.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Jeff Swindells,
University of Missouri.

I mean this is the obvious question, but if
we are to have preservation partners and we are
distributing digital masters, then number five is only
true for a subset of that distribution.

TED PRIEBE: Agreed, yes, yeah.

So where we're at with this assumption could
be that in a affirmative distribution situation where
depository libraries select and request files to be
pushed to them, the scenario perhaps for discussion if
needed would be, you know, is a single optimized
version of content acceptable to be a broad-based push,
or is there a definitive need and additional
requirements perhaps that would need to be flushed out
for print optimized, screen optimized, web optimized.
There's a lot of scenarios that could unfold and
certainly would affect the complexity and ultimate cost
of FDsys in that type of a distribution model. So,
from that scenario, I would maybe close this. Could it
be that the system starts out with an affirmative
distribution of a single optimized format that we would
validate with the community of, you know, here's what
we would propose moving forward and go from there.

Some of these are easy issues; some are not as easy, but certainly good discussion.

Under number six, GPO distributes digital files to libraries under the aegis of the FDLP, and the various requirements and obligations of Title 44 apply, and I would say again in today's terms, we are bound by Title 44, and that would be the assumption at least moving forward not to say that there could not be changes as we move forward from our oversight.

And with that, I'd like to turn it over to Richard, and we'll get into some issues and questions for discussion. Thank you.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thanks for getting this started, Teddy. I think that we've already raised a number of issues that are not going to be on the slides and aren't on your handouts, but I think that's the whole purpose of this kind of discussion, and I'm going to be interested from the audience very shortly about some of your thoughts on some of these as well.

But the first one I think that has been identified by GPO staff is that, as it said here, authenticated files and access to GPO server may display differently from the same files located on an individual library server's. And I think that's going to raise the question that's already on the sheet as we

get down to the question sections, but well I guess

some of the things that this raises in my mind is, of

course, why and that has to do with, I think, the

different purposes if it's optimized for print versus

web or what have you, it's going to look different.

The big question for me that would come out of this

would be is the content going to change? I would hope

the answer to that is "no," but if it does, I think

that raises a whole set of additional issues,

particularly if something is authenticated, you're

authenticating content. But, anyway, so that's

something to keep in mind I think.

The second issue, of course, is costs. I

think we're always concerned with costs, local costs.

All of us who are working intangible depository formats

know that there are lots of costs involved with

microform storage, shelving, staff issues and things

like that, and I think those are -- I don't know that

they're going to get worse, but they certainly are not

going to go away in terms of the issues that all of us

have to deal with in our depository libraries. So

that's clearly another major issue for us to be

considering. And I think it's an issue to be

considered as we think about the differences between

push and pull and how much voluntary digital documents

we take -- we want to start accessing and retaining
versus how many get pushed and under what circumstances
do they get pushed. So, costs are always going to be a
big issue for us I think.

And I guess again this issue comes out of the
fact that all of us have not bought the same servers
with the same specifications, and we have different
amounts of storage and ways to manage that. So all of
those issues are also going to be part of our decision
making and the impacts on our institutions when we
start to bring these digital documents into our
libraries and into our depositories.

I'm not inviting questions right now, because
this is all intended to stimulate questions, and in the
slide after this one will be the first question that
comes up, and then if these things are stirring around
in your minds, you're probably going to ask questions
all over the place, and that's exactly what we want.

TED PRIEBE: Richard, this is a long one.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Yeah, it is a long one, but
I'm just trying to quickly review it again. It does
seem to me that the essential issue here is, is that
difference between what's the requirement if you
voluntarily pull a document down or get into a
situation where you're subscribe, if you will, in a

push environment. And once you opt for the push

option, it's seems to me you're taking on some

additional responsibilities. I think of the Hamlet

question, "to be or not to be," and the question here

is a bad paraphrase but "to push or to pull" and then

how do we decide to work in that environment.

So, those, I think, are at least what has

been identified from the discussions so far the -- what

has been identified as the major issues, and I would

imagine that all of you, council as well as those of

you in the audience, are going to have additional

issues and raise them and, of course, as I said, that's

we want to do.

So let's move to the first question that

you've got on your sheet and that's here on the slide

as "Partners are concerned that files contained FDsys

may become different from files stored in depository

libraries. How can data synchronization best be

addressed?" Council members? I mean this is --

PETER HEMPHILL: Peter Hemphill with Hemphill

and Associates.

This was a continual issue we had

synchronizing data worldwide for different versions.

It's important when GPO starts out doing this that they

have a unique identifier for all of those files, as

well as a unique date time down to the resolution
necessary to be able to determine what version that
file is, so that rather than trying to do differences
on files or huge, long comparisons about the
information itself, you have identifiers that you can
quickly compare and run lists against each other to
find the exceptions and the issues and the versions.

MARK SANDLER: Well, I certainly agree with
Pete. This is a very difficult problem for any
management of a large corpus. But I guess given that
we're dealing with government information, you know, I
guess I'm wondering the extent to which the community
thinks replacement is appropriate or whether they would
expect to have successive versions available so that
those changes can accurately be tracked over time.

So it, you know, it may be that indeed in
this case the strategies look a little different than
those that are more commonly applied by commercial
publications.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Jeff Swindells.

You're asking how, and I'm certainly not
going to weigh in on the hows. But earlier we said
that preservation and conservation techniques are not
an FDLP requirement. Okay? There is a sort of
maintenance of collections requirement.

But when we get to digital files, and we are concerned about whether they're the same, we are talking about it at some level bit-level preservation, at least check sums. So I don't know how to do that, but we need to at least build in those kind of things. And the fact of the matter, this is not -- I mean it's a big issue, but we're all dealing with the issue all over the place. So GPO's not alone in this.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne.

In terms of how we would do this, I think the best way to do it is to give us the files and let us play with them. The only way we'll get experience is by doing it.

RICHARD AKEROYD: That takes me back to a question I asked earlier from when I was sitting over there. Have we got any experience yet that would help enlighten this for people who have voluntarily started to download files and play with them and so forth, and then what kind of interaction between GPO and those libraries has there been that might enlighten this.

And if there are no other questions from council, we might maybe let people in the audience weigh in on this one a little bit if there's anybody out there that's been doing this and playing with them.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hello. I'm Scott Matheson

from CU Law Library.

I want to point out that data synchronization it might make sense to have the most recent copy at a lot of our libraries, but some of us who have more of a research focus do want exactly what Mark was talking about, the serialization in kind of every version possible. And that's exactly what the lock system does. It saves all the old copies. So it doesn't directly address your synchronization question, but it does address at least the subset of us who do want all of the versions. That's one way to do deal with and those folks have worked out that problem, and it's open source, so you could ask them and they will explain how it works.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Was that a sales pitch, Mark?

Yes, sir, please.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I'm Pat Ragains from the University of Nevada Reno.

And I also think that a way to identify all the parts of a publication and all the versions distinctly is very important. It's essential.

We have done sort of a small test project digitizing some congressional hearings related to the history of Nevada, and we had to choose a way to name

those files. And we selected the OCLC number. That
seems to be a good beginning. It was not a -- it
wasn't sufficient in all cases because we can into
multi-part publications that were scanned separately,
and so we had to tag on some additional characters at
the end of the OCLC number to identify those individual
parts, but it seemed to me that something like the OCLC
number as a unique identifier, you know, it's already
been established, and it's at least worth considering.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Richard, can I offer
comment really quick, and I think it would -- this is
Katrina from council -- because we do this at the FED
in St. Louis. I mean we pull these files. We pull
tons of data files, and we save every iteration.

I think, you know, we're relatively unique,
but I think what GPO needs to do is offer options,
because the public library only wants the most current
CPI, and they don't care what it looked in 1957. And
that's a reason response to their public and to their
constituents, but I think if GPO offers options, then
the research community and the public libraries can all
best their constituents needs.

TED PRIEBE: I've just -- Ted Priebe -- I
have a quick followup on that just to maybe propose not

as a solution, but just a thought, would the scenario
of digital distribution of GPO pushing a new version
out automatically to anyone who's made a selection
profile that requested that originally be one of the
mechanisms here. And then it still doesn't resolve the
issue of how that is synchronized on a depository
server and making sure that it's the most recently
accessible. But would that be a workable option to
consider.

     PETER HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill,
Hemphill and Associates.

     One thing you'll have to consider is -- and
consider carefully -- is that profile, because some
institutions may or may not want archival quality
information, and so the synchronization of that is
going to differ based on what you deliver originally,
because you may end up delivering optimized files
versus archival quality files to that institution.

     ANN MILLER: This is Ann Miller from council.

     I guess I don't understand. To me that
sounds like it contradicts with what Scott was wanting,
which is what I want, because I run a research
institution where I want all the versions. So if GPO
pushes out a new version every time it changes and it
overlays on the version I hold, then that doesn't solve

my problem of wanting to be able to track the changes
through time. So I think I understand that was what
you were saying, but I was busy notes and maybe I
don't.

TED PRIEBE: Okay. This is Ted Priebe again.

I wasn't trying to describe that GPO would
overwrite a version of the file at a depository
library, but merely push it out and make it available,
so the whole process of how your files are stored in
your institution, although that may be a policy issue
as well, it wouldn't be GPO overriding the previous
version. It would be an automatic process that any
time there was a change perhaps, and that's -- this
isn't something definitive that we're saying we're
going to do, but it's just a discussion point.

ANN MILLER: This is Ann again.

I think what we want is both options. We
want -- I mean some people will only want the current
version of, you know, one that I think of as the CIA
list of leaders in different countries which I keep
forever. But my local public library, if they were a
depository, probably only wants the current one, so
that they can look who's the foreign minister in
Albania. I want to know who were the foreign ministers
of Albania going back as far as the publication goes.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Let me take a moment and apologize for my cell phone. And that might be a reminder for the rest up here, so there are a lot of us who might want to turn them off now. It's embarrassing.

Anyway, okay, there are three more people at the mike so far anyway. Go ahead, please.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Amy West, University of Minnesota.

I guess I'm a little confused why this is a question. Now, if you select something that's accumulated or superceded and don't wish to keep those back versions, then you have a staff person go and remove those and you modify your work. I mean that's part of the processing, and I guess I'm not quite clear on why this would be any different. You choose to receive the records based on your selection profile. You might change your profile. You might have different retention rates, and I wonder if somebody can explain what it is that they're worried about. I mean is it purely the idea that files are going to be overridden, because if that's the primary concern, I mean there are pretty easy solutions for that.

So I was wondering if people could maybe explain a little bit more about what's behind this

question.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill, Hemphill and Associates.

From past experience, what happens is when you distribute things out in the field, there are disc system crashes, people lose content, they go offline for a period of time, come back online for a period of time, and so they end up needing a means to reconcile what they have in their collection. So this would be a method to help reconcile their collection. They also may add collections, and they may also want to remove collections. So they need to be able to go out and say, "Okay, I now want this collection." And they may have turned off that collection for a while, and then want to pick up and continued back on. So they need means to reconcile those collections when they end up in any of those circumstances.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Okay, thank you.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Please.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Okay.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Stephen West, Penn State.

This may confuse the issue a little bit, but the question is regarding to authentication to pushed files. What responsibility will an institution that hasn't had a file pushed to them from GPO to determine

-- and we're obviously going to be playing with these files, which means that they're changing. You know, what issues or requirements are there that, you know, what a user is going to be looking at a file that's sitting at Penn State that's been played with, changed maybe, the whole issue of authentication of that file that's pushed? Does that make sense?

        RICHARD AKEROYD: I just -- GPO staff may want to respond to that, but my sense is if you've got an authenticated file, you've got a responsibility to not play with it and change it. Otherwise, you lose its authentication, and I don't know enough about authentication, but it would seem to me that once that stamp goes on there, maybe you don't have the ability to play with it and change it.

        AUDIENCE SPEAKER: This is Lisa Russell. I'm with GPO. Authentication, the mechanism that we're looking at right now applies to signature. If you change the file, it breaks the signature. So -- and that's the mechanism that we use to make sure that it is actually the official version, and that it hasn't been, you know, whether it was intentionally done with under -- for good reasons or if someone's trying to mess with [inaudible], and that the content hasn't been changed since it was disseminated by GPO.

PETER HEMPHILL: While we have the person at the mike, maybe they can answer this question, because I've been curiously pondering it, -- this is Peter Hemphill of Hemphill and Associates -- what is the considered the authentic version. Is it only the archival quality version?

LISA RUSSELL: I think it's a policy issue that we're going to have to address. Right now we're looking at --

PETER HEMPHILL: There is the policy right there.

RIC DAVIS: This is Ric Davis from the Government Printing Office. I think our current plan is that we would certainly be moving forward FDsys once we authenticate the digital preservation master, and you would make access derivatives from those. The access level derivatives that we would push out are also going to be authenticated by GPO, but you want to make sure that you've got that preservation master both in an authenticated and an unauthenticated version so as technology changes in the future, you're able to migrate.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Your colleague thanks you for coming to the rescue, Ric. Donna?

DONNA K0EPP: Donna Koepp [phonetic], Harvard

College Library.

Just a point of clarification, and maybe this is so obvious I should understand this, but if a library chooses not to pull or to receive the pushed documents, are these materials going to be available to us anyway, and would we be able to go into a central file and just get an authenticated copy?

TED PRIEBE: Yes. This is Ted Priebe.

Under the FDsys model, that authenticated content would be available as it is in today's world of GPO access for you to download and have accessible without any restrictions.

LISA KEITH: And would all versions be there?

TED PRIEBE: With FDsys, you would be able to access previous versions of content as well through the system.

LISA KEITH: Thank you.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico.

I'm probably more confused than Amy is on this one because she's more technologically savvy than I am. I don't necessarily understand your scenario, Peter, when you say someone logs off and comes back in later. That's just that individual user within the FDsys or if I'm downloading files or I'm getting files

pushed to me. If I log off and at some point I come
back in, I still have access to that material
regardless of what the version is.

RICHARD AKEROYD: It's not --

DAN BARKLEY: Go ahead.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Yeah, I'm sorry. It's not
a matter of logging off; it's a matter of you go away
for whatever reason. Maybe your systems go offline and
haven't received a feed in a while.

DAN BARKLEY: But we would still have access
to whatever had been previously pushed as well as
anything that was new; is that correct, Ted?

TED PRIEBE: What? I'm sorry, I was -- I
couldn't hear all the thread on that, but specific to
the depository library and if they went offline or had
an issue, the content will always be accessible via
FDsys.

DAN BARKLEY: Okay.

TED PRIEBE: But the issue of synchronization
of if a -- you're at a depository and they didn't get
the most recent version, that is a constraint or a risk
in this type of scenario that you would potentially not
have the most recent version that is available through
the system.

DAN BARKLEY: But you would still have access

to the earlier versions; correct?

        TED PRIEBE: At the depository library?

        DAN BARKLEY: Yes.

        TED PRIEBE: Yeah, I would think so as long

as --

        DAN BARKLEY: Okay.

        TED PRIEBE: -- long as they could access the

server --

        DAN BARCKLEY: All right.

        TED PRIEBE: -- or it's just the issue of the

data push that would be the concern if I understand

Peter's explanation.

        DAN BARCKLEY: Okay. The reason I asked is

because one of the assumptions that we've all been

working under is, of course, that anything we do is in

compliance with current T-44 regulations. So it would

seem to me that the electronic files are in some ways

no different than the paper equivalence in that, you

know, we get certain things, and then we get updates,

we still have the original and we have the most

current, whether it's in a tangible or an electronic

format, and I'll use the healthcare finance

administration with the all the different transmittals

that we are inundated with on a daily basis, things

like that. You have the current and you have the

updates, and we choose whether or not to retain the

older material. And that's why, so I would assume that

it would work in a systematic manner in an electronic

environment. Is that -- am I assuming that correctly

or am I just watching too much Star Trek lately?

TED PRIEBE: Dan, I have to be honest about

it. You're a 100 percent followed the thread on that,

but the content and the responsibilities of a

depository library as they choose to have content

pushed to them and in the current Title 44, that would

not change in an electronic environment.

DAN BARKLEY: Okay. Well, being a regional

then, we would get everything by virtue of us still

being a regional.

TED PRIEBE: That is certainly one I think

the critical policy issues -- [cross-talk] [inaudible]

DAN BARKLEY: Okay. That would we need

further work on?

TED PRIEBE: We really need to have --

DAN BARKLEY: Just the other comment I just

wanted to make, and I appreciate both Peter and Ted's

responses is that, you know, one of the assumptions

you've talked about, there's no clear articulation for

libraries to do conservation preservation. And while

that may not be a clear articulation within Title 44, I

think any regional and any of our selectives that
retains material does inherent conservation and
archiving so that the material that we get today will
be available to you through 20 years from now or 50
years from now, so I think it's important to keep that
in mind that we do do a lot of archiving and
conservation even though it may not be a clear mandate
within T-44.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you, Dan. I need to
point out, Dan, when you came to the mike, there was
nobody behind you, and now there are three people, so
you've kept continuing the conversation. I'm going to
take the one question from the person standing at the
mike, but in the interest of time, we have three more
published questions that we'd like to get through.

So, you two who just went back to your seats,
if you want to hold onto those questions in case we
have some time at the end. And always, always remember
that there are a lot of e-mail addresses to which you
can forward questions or concerns or statements that if
you don't get a chance to mention this morning, please.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: My Stephanie Braunstein,
and I'm from Louisiana State university, and my comment
may be partly a question and partly a suggestion, but
in terms of sending or pushing the new versions of

electronic data that may be slightly different in this
new version from a prior version, could there be some
way of notifying us, as recipients, of what parts have
changed, something along the lines of a list of
sections effective model? I think that would make it a
lot easier in terms of research certainly to know what
has changed since the previous edition or publication
of the same material.

TED PRIEBE: This is Ted Priebe for FDsys,
and I may try to defer a bit for any of our colleagues
on the FDsys, but in terms of version control as it
relates to the future digital system, there will be
version triggers that will be used that will connotate
[sic] when a new version has been activated, if you
will, but the scope of how in implementation of that
how that can be conveyed and what mechanism it can be
conveyed, I'm not sure that we have that level of
granularity in the requirement of the system on how to
enable that. We would be to describe what connotative
version trigger and what would describe, but I don't
know on that volume of a system if that is a technology
that we could currently implement in the dissemination
of access derivatives or preservation masters for that
matter.

Additional thoughts?

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill of
Hemphill and Associates.

I can tell you from private industry
experience that this is a very expensive endeavor. We
had discontinued that practice just because of the
sheer expense, because it takes a human to put that
information in. Now there are things like interfiled
documents that show you the end result. It may not
show you the changes. There could be red-lined
documents that may be available. I don't know how
FDsys plans on handling all of those, but I can tell
you that if somebody was to manually -- unless it came
as a source with the document, it's very expensive to
try and do.

STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN: That's what I figured.
I know it would take a human being to do some editorial
work on that, yes. Thank you.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you. Let's move on
to the next question. And I think this goes back to
one that was posed a little bit earlier. It's should
regionals have to accept and retain all digital files
pushed to depository libraries, and I guess this
specifically focused on regionals.

Our subsets or subject speciality is going to
be allowed for regional libraries. And this kind of

reflects some other discussions that have been ongoing about shared regionals and everything else. I think we've just added a layer of thinking and decision making as we move down the path of shared regional responsibilities and things. Any thoughts from council on this one?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Jeff Swindells, University of Missouri.

Given that in the print, in the tangible environment, regionals are already discussing shared arrangements and questioning the need for every regional to have everything. Then I think the answer to the first part is no, they should not be required to hold three terabytes of data in addition to everything else they're holding.

On the second question, I think absolutely. I think that regionals that decide or any library that decides to grab a subset of material and have that pushed to them should -- that should be their option.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Tim?

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne.

I agree completely with Jeff here that I think we really need to not put too much restrictions based on Title 44 on what we're distributing to the regionals or we're going to lose regionals. And I

think that regional is another, you know, large depository libraries are going to be our laboratory in this, and that's where we're going to learn how to do these sort of things. And so whether we start off doing this as a pilot project and for several years really get the experience that we need and then can start deciding which rules apply to us. I really would much rather see that than just write off the bat say we have to follow everything that's in Title 44.

And I think that even Title 44 is something that is subject to interpretation and subject to definitions. The definitions that some think -- as Judy Russell was saying last fall, are different than what Teddy is saying today.

I know that in the past when we first wanted tangible electronic products distributed depository libraries, the public printer at that time was not in favor of it, and the GPO general counsel said that according to Title 44, GPO did not have the authority to do that. There was a change in personnel at GPO, and suddenly the general counsel is saying, "Yes, GPO can do that." And it's just a matter of definitions, so we don't want a really firm, you know, interpretation of Title 44. There's a lot of leeway we can do there.

RICHARD AKEROYD: That's a helpful
perspective, Tim. I think that's going to help
everybody as we think through this whole process.

Anybody else on council want to chime in on
this one?

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: I guess -- this is Bill
Sudduth -- I think the horse already left the barn,
because we don't -- we're not required as regionals to
have all of GPO access pushed to us and I think it
would be tough for me to then go back to my
administration and say, "We now have to accept
everything." It would be better if the situation were
we can build relative collections that our clientele
would use, and then share that across the country. But
we haven't been required to store GPO access at this
point, and so this is, you know, again, I think the
horse already left the barn.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Denise.

DENISE DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA.

Isn't the question really about accessability
here in that providing free public access to the
content is really what's critical. And if a
participating depository, full or selective, determines
that the way that they can do that is by storing it
locally, then that's what they choose to do.

But really within Title 44, it's about access
and retrievability, which doesn't help GPO, but it does
-- I think it creates a different landscape and permits
institutions, organizations, libraries that wish to
become more active partners, either as a mirror sites
or other -- whatever the next technology is, but mirror
sites is really what we have to support.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Ric?

RIC DAVIS: I'd like to make one comment.
Ric Davis from GPO.

I think in response to that question too, I
think what we need to look at in terms of policy is
whether or not we're talking about the regional
responsibility in terms of an access level copy of a
file or what new model we might need to look at in
terms of a flexible program in the future for
partnerships with regionals for holding those
preservation level masters in partnership with GPO and
whether or not there is different policy and
interpretation of Title 44 as well, depending on
whether it's an access level copy or a preservation
master.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Good. Thank you, Ric.
Anyone else on council?

RICHARD AKEROYD: Kathy.

KATHY HALE: Kathy Hale, State Library of
Pennsylvania.

To answer that first question, I would say
no; isn't that the whole point of FDsys and your
assumption earlier of having perhaps other sites that
would have other parts of the collection? I personally
can't speak for the state library, but I don't think
we'd have the server space to keep the entire
collection, nor would we probably want it, because it
could be available in other spaces that we could
perhaps have things specifically about Pennsylvania or
those things that my selectives would have a large
interest in, so that if they did want to get rid of
their files, there would be a place that they could go
to get it. But I'm thinking the place to go to get it
would be the FDsys or some of those others, as council
said mirrored sites or whatever you want to call it, so
that that would be enormous stress upon especially
regionals who are not large academics to stay within
the system and have all of that collected.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you.

ANN SANDERS: Ann Sanders. I'm from the
Library of Michigan.

I think it's pretty unequivocal that the
short answer to the first question is "no." But really

if you look at the tangible model, we've already got an

out and it's called selective housing. Or if you look

at it, the Census Bureau state data center program, you

have the same model there where the Census Bureau says

very explicitly that the lead agency is not responsible

for providing all of the services, but rather they're

responsible for seeing that it's available within the

state-wide network, and I think that it's just sort of

a non-question, because there are ways to deal with

that even in the current model.

My other comment is I'm delighted to see the

phrasing of the second question, because the one thing

I do not want to see for either regionals or selectives

is a push model that's based on agency. Agency --

sorry, see that was a wonderful 19th century solution,

but it's time to move on, and a subject speciality or

some other kind of approach is definitely called for

here.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Aimee.

AIMEE QUINN: Aimee Quinn. Central New Mexico

Community College.

I guess I'm going to be disagreeing with

everybody, because I think the answer is "yes," and

yes, I have worked in regional, and I know that the big

problem is space but we selectives do depend on our

regionals to have everything.

I think that the law -- one of the reasons that we need remember in a policy perspective is that the regionals are responsible for the redundancy to make sure that there is this information out there. And FDsys is going a wonderful step forward when we finally get there, but I am nervous about not having that redundancy, and maybe that's the historian in me, but the redundancy is a very vital part of the regency -- I mean the region, the regional program.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you. Anything further? Jeff?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: This is just to respond to Aimee's comment. I actually -- I agree and I disagree. I think that part of the second question, a different way of asking it is, is 100 percent of that content available in the regional library system, so that, you know, are we saying that each regional should have a 100 percent. I don't think that makes in this environment. Or are we saying that together, all the regionals have a 100 percent of that content. And that might be a way to insure some of that.

AIMEE QUINN: I'm Aimee Quinn, CNM. I'm not going to say the whole thing again.

Yes, it's true. And I actually do believe in

shared regionals and I believe that regionals shouldn't
have to be just bound by state, but I do think that the
concept of the regional is what can't be forgotten.
That's what I'm trying to get to, of course. Maybe we
need to redefine it, but the concept is still viable in
the digital age.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Cynthia, did you have a
comment?

CYNTHIA ETKIN: Yeah, I do. Cynthia Etkin,
Government Printing Office.

I want to address Amy's first question about
redundancy, and I just wanted to assure everybody that
redundancy is built into FDsys in geographically
separate locations.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Oops, hurry up, because
we're going to be moving on to the next question.

MARY MARTIN: Okay, Mary Martin, Libraries of
the Claremont Colleges.

Based on what Cindy just said that the
question that keeps occurring in my mind -- and I don't
know I may have stuff thrown at me -- is everything is
going to be available through FDsys and on a
geographically disbursed basis -- in other words,
there's going to be more than one site -- I don't
understand why regionals would do that at all.

I mean if we can -- the point of tangible regionals or regionals that have tangible documents was that people needed to be able to physically go somewhere close to them and not have to go all the way to Washington to read a copy of something. So if you can read a copy of something online from anywhere, I don't understand why we need to have regionals do this at all.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's move onto the third question. We're -- we still have some time. I don't want to feel too pressed, but I do want to make sure we at least get through each of the prepared questions.

The third question is when GPO -- there you go. I don't have to read it for you now, but anyway as changed versions go out regarding a digital file, what level of responsibility do libraries have to inform their users about other versions?

I think I can anticipate one response to this from the audience, but I'm not sure. Anybody on council have some thoughts on this?

MARK SANDLER: Mark Sandler from CIC.

And I guess this question to my mind relates closely to the first question we were discussing.

And yes, indeed, this is a technical question

and it's an economic question, it's a work flow
question, but I guess it, you know, at root to me, it's
a political question. And, you know, I'm sure we all
want to trust our government to be an agent of good and
not evil, but undoubtedly governments have an interest
revising and extending and sometimes correcting the
record. And it's a much easier thing to my mind to do
that in an electronic world than a print world. It's
much easier to override a file. It's so much easier to
override a file unbeknownst to people that are holding
that file. It's much easier to modify the record as we
go forward in time. And I guess, you know, for me it's
a question as to whether we trust GPO as the sort of
keeper of the tablets even knowing their an agent of
government, or whether indeed the library community is
in a better position to take that more independent
stance and protect that record through modifications of
versions or tracking better on those modifications of
versions.

And I just know how difficult it is and
libraries feeling like they have the opportunity to
make decisions when documents -- when there's a request
to recall a document. It's still a question as to
whether or not in fact libraries are going to comply.
And I think in an electronic world, it's for me an

issue of whether libraries want to maintain that independent judgment or whether indeed it becomes a technical solution where they lose control of that process.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Ann.

ANN MILLER: Ann Miller.

I'm not going even go where Mark went, because he does it so much better than I do, but when I saw this, my first instinct was as a reference librarian. And I'm looking at that going okay. Yes, every time I search on somebody who wants their biology textbook that they don't really want to buy, and we have all the old versions, it's imperative as I work with the reference question to point out to them that this is the 1982 version of this Biology of Evolution book as opposed to the 2000 version.

But on the other hand, if someone's studying Hamlet, I don't try and explain the intricacies of the good Porto and the bad Porto, which have, you know, books written on.

So I think we're talking about elements of scale. I'm a large selective. There is no way in hell that I can alert all of my users about all of the changes in all of the versions of all of the digital products that I might have pushed to me. It's just not

-- it can't happen.

So in my mind, it's got to be stated clearly on the file. That's what we do with books. It's an imprint statement. It says edition one, edition two. It says version one, version two, and part of my responsibility as a reference librarian is to point some of these out to my users as they're using them, but I can't proactively inform everyone of the changes. I'm not sure that's what they're asking, but the reference librarian in me went "Oh, my God."

RICHARD AKEROYD: I think the reference librarian in you gave us a good perspective on that. So thank you for that.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina.

And Mark was very eloquent and very practical, but if you're going to push changes to a file, aren't you pushing changes in the metadata? Can't that metadata be put into your system and update the information in your system? I mean if it's just another 856 line, then it pushes it, and it's there and it's done. Maybe you receive a little notice too that pops upon FDLP Desktop that says, "These documents were changed. We've pushed you the cataloging changes" or "you can get the cataloging, the metadata changes for

you whatever." But that's my comment on that.

But Mark also did raise something that is not in the this question, and that is the pull down issue. You know when something disappears. That's not a change in, that's a change of access.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill. The one thing that with regard to private industry how some of this was handled was exactly like Bill had mentioned. The capacity when sending metadata, we allowed certain users the ability to take that list of those changes and they would have their own corresponding list real unique to that unique identifier. If something has changed and it was an e-mail list, then they would simply e-mail their users. So we handled it through metadata and logging so that they had a retrospective capability to go and look and see what's changed and when.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Okay, thank you, Pete. Let's take the two people who are standing in line, and then move on to the last question, and then we'll come back if there's any time for any left over questions.

Please?

AMY WEST: Amy West, University of Minnesota. I just wanted to say that one thing to keep in mind is that there's a quite a bit of depository material that

is changeable by nature. The BEA constantly revises

their calculations for nearly everything they publish.

I have years of REIS economic discs in my drawers,

because they revised the data and because I'm too lazy

to toss them and even though accumulate.

I think we need to ask ourselves what's the

difference between information that is necessarily

revised as part of its [indecipherable] with a

substantial portion of their material too.

And I think we also need to be really careful

about the territory that we can lock into. At this

particular moment, my political views do not line up

with the current administration. I think it's safe to

say that I could not possibly keep that out of any list

I made of changes of material if I thought that was

based on a political aspect. And I think we're

treading into really tricky water. I think it's enough

to get the version, keep the versions and have them

made accessible with some sort of time step change or

metadata change as bill described.

STEVE HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre

Dame, and I have done government documents for years

and years and years and years, and I'm constantly

amazed as to why discussing new formats as if we

suddenly changed them. If the take the phrase out of a

digital file available and say when GPO makes or
distributes a new changed version, what
[indecipherable] view of the information? We have
gotten senseless paper materials where it said oops, we
had a whole wrong page. Glue a new one on top of it.
Did we send out a notice to oh, my God, all census
users. Please remember on page number two of 1972,
it's changed. How many of us did the pen and ink
changes in paper?

You know there's a certain responsibility and
we do preservation microfilming at my institution, and
there's a field that says "This is not the original
version. This is the presentation microfilm." You're
reinventing the wheel when it's already done. Stop
trying to recalculate things based on a format.

I'll go back number two. I'm tired of
hearing the regionals whine about "We get too much
paper. We get too much fiche. Now we're getting too
much digital. If you're regionals, you have the
obligation of regionals. One of those was
geographically disbursed for protection so we could --
Mary -- we could ride our horse and get their
efficiently. You know there are obligations you assume
them. You don't want to do that any more, become a
selective. Otherwise, figure a way that you're already

selective housing and all these other things to maintain. You know we are the library of record. We are responsible to make sure have a complete collection.

Do we house it physically yourself? Maybe not. You know, so in some of these, I love the discussion, but wipe out the format and then ask the question again. Would we notify all of our users of every change that comes through? We don't. I can't get the researchers to read the footnotes now as to what they are, let alone go whole, you know. Maybe there was a revised version that was put out, but do you really want to take a look at them. This will do. This is fine. Real researchers, as Ann has pointed out, will know I have to check and see if there's a different more authoritative version. The rest of them don't care. We do. I know, thank you.

RICHARD AKEROYD: I was at a legislative hearing recently, and a young woman got up and really, really made an impassioned plea for the point that she was making, and the chairman of the committee when she was finished, he said, "Thank you so much for introducing a little passion into these generally boring hearings. Steve, thank you very much for getting a little passion at this end of this

discussion.

Let's go onto the fourth question.

TIM BYRNE: Richard, can I quickly just defend whining regionals?

RICHARD AKEROYD: I'm sorry, Tim Byrne.

TIM BYRNE: I would like to point out to Steven that if his regional in Indiana did decide to take his advice and quit whining and just stop being regional, that he would no longer be able to discard material and pretty soon he would be whining.

PETER HEMPHILL: And just -- this is Pete Hemphill -- one quick point. I totally agree with you Steven with one exception, and that is technology enables you to do some things that you didn't used to be able to do with hard copy. For example, you could e-mail your patrons that something had changed. That used to not be a capability that you could do on a mass scale.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Ted, you have a facility for making the last question a long one. Anyway, let's see where were we.

Is the role for libraries wishing to receive the preservation level files to insure redundancy for -- or is there a role for libraries to do this redundancy for permanent public access? Will the

distribution of files via FDsys provide the opportunity for permanent public access partnerships through provision of access derivative files and long-term partnerships for preservation level files?

I'm glad you all can read that as well as hearing it read.

Ann?

ANN MILLER: Okay, yes. I mean -- it took a long time, but this is kind of a well duh moment. Yes. We have partnerships now. That's what the depository program is. We're going to have digital partnerships. We're going to have digitization partnerships, yeah.

RICHARD AKEROYD: I like the eloquence of "yeah."

MARK SANDLER: Mark Sandler from CIC, and I guess I would -- I guess the thing that bothers me about this is the word "wish." You know, lots of people wish to do lots of things, but there are standards out there in the community evolving standards, developing standards for certifying repositories. There's trusted digital repositories. There are certain conditions that we hope folks who declare themselves as repositories we'll in fact need and adhere to. And I guess I would like to know that those folks who are wishing to do this and partnering

with GPO are actually adhering to these standards and
that they are enforced.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Other members of council?
Yes, go ahead, please.

ELIZABETH COWELL: Hi. I'm Elizabeth Cowell
from Stanford University.

And think beyond geographic distribution,
administrative distribution is important to libraries.
So, we have different funding streams. We don't rely
on Congress for our funding at Stanford, so that just
makes things even more preserved I guess I would say.
Is, you know, the realistic deal that Bruce James said
was going to be the salvation, you know, leasing the
building, whatever, doesn't look like it's happening
the way he thought, you know, so if all eggs are in
that basket for the GPO, that's fine if there are other
kind of funding streams keeping step say at other
institutions. So it's not just geographic; it's
administration redundancy. I think it's good.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you. Next?

SANDRA MACK: Sandra Mack, University of
Kentucky, Regional Depository Library.

And to answer Mary's question, that's the
answer, yes, I think it's very important, echoing what
Elizabeth just said, that the redundancy is not just

within the federal government; that it's in other
administrative streams, as she described it, and
provides more protection for these files.

I also agree with Jeff that we may not all
want to take everything, but we need to find a way out
in library land to reflect all of this digital
information.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you. Yes?

STEPHEN WEST: Steve with Penn State.

It seems to me that questions two and four
are asking the simple question, what happens if the
Government Printing Office becomes defunct. Because, I
mean, I think we're all in agreement that FDsys it's a
great concept. It's the question that it's in our mind
is will it be around forever. And we all know that
agencies fold, and that part of our responsibility as
librarians is to maintain the integrity of our
historical memory.

And I think really what the question is
begging is do we have a plan in place that if the
Government Printing Office no longer existed that we
would have a way to retain all that has been spent to
create this system.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you. Barbie, I cut
you off before, so if you want comment on this one and

then go back to your first question, I think we have
time for that as well.

BARBIE SELBY: The other one was covered.

Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

And I think there is a role not only for
libraries wishing to do this, but as we talked about in
the vision statement, for other internet memory
organizations to do this. And I would not want to
discount somebody like Internet Archive or the Way Back
Machine or the Open Content Alliance, or even, God
forbid, having now worked with Goggle, Goggle as a
possibility for some of this redundancy as well.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you. Tim?

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne.

I've been lately involved in a digitization
project, that I will actually make a presentation on
tomorrow, that involves technical reports. And as part
of my role in that group, I've been contacting federal
agencies and talking to them about material that was
distributed 60 years ago, and in many cases, they don't
have it. And it is -- you know, if we're relying on a
federal agency to provide permanent public access, it
doesn't happen, so we need to insure redundancy.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Can I ask one quick
question?

RICHARD AKEROYD: Certainly.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: And this wasn't in any of the other things. Just a -- sort of on FDsys and this push concept, what would be available to non-FDL's? What would be available to public libraries who are part of the program, individual researchers?

TED PRIEBE: I think that's a -- Ted Priebe. It's certainly a policy decision at this point that has not been made, but it's certainly one that we can take back as a discussion topic in terms of how that could be enabled and should it be. And so I don't have a definitive answer "yes" or "no." It is a policy issue that we would have to work through.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Very good.

TED PRIEBE: Katrina

RICHARD AKEROYD: You're the policy man this morning, Ric.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis from the Government Printing Office.

I think the thing that we need to look at that -- look at in relation to that also is that we support the public also through the FDLP. And the salaries and expenses appropriation that we receive from Congress is to provide this access through the FDLP. So I think as Ted mentioned, it's a policy

question that we need to go back and look at in terms

of our relationship of our funding model to the FDLP

and what we can provide to the public.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

Private industry is very interested in

numerous kinds of public of public en mass. And I can

tell you that that would be good idea to provide it.

ANN MILLER: Yeah, let me second that.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Well, we're right on time,

so I appreciate all the comments that came this

morning. I think GPO staff certainly has a lot to chew

on, police and otherwise, with respect to the questions

that came up that were raised and maybe partially

answered in some degree, but I think more of us are

going to ponder these a lot longer.

Thank you all very much for coming this

morning.

(Off the record from 10:01 a.m. to 10:33 a.m.)

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Good morning again, and

welcome back from the break.

Our two speakers for the session on training

depository librarians and training non-depository

librarians is Tim Byrne, documents librarian at

University of Colorado Boulder, and Kirsten Clark. She

is the INLS grant project manager at University of

Colorado and future-to-be the regional at the
University of Minnesota in July.

So, I'd like to welcome Tim and Kirsten and
let them start.

TIM BYRNE: So, the purpose of this
presentation is to talk about the INLS grant that the
University of Colorado has received. We've titled it
"Government Information of the 21st Century," but it's
a Laura Kay Bush Librarians in the 21st century grant
from INLS.

So what we're going to do this morning is as
the principal investigator, I'm going to talk about how
the grant came to be and what we were trying to
accomplish with this land proposal, and then Kirsten,
as the project manager, is going to talk about what we
have been doing since September and what we will be
doing in the next year and a half.

So the genesis of the grant, the University
of Colorado at Boulder is one of two regionals in the
State of Colorado and also serves as a regional for the
State of Wyoming.

One of the ways that we try to carry out our
regional responsibilities is by holding regular
meetings with our selectives. And at one of these
meetings several years back, I asked the selectives

what they really wanted from the regional in terms of
services; what they wanted me to concentrate on. And
they essentially gave me a list in priority order of
training, training and training. I said "Great, now
I'm going to discard this."

So what I want to talk about is some of the
training that we have been doing here in Colorado that
led to the development of the grant. So the first is
the group that I mentioned. You know we meet on a
regular basis which is the government publications
interest group of Colorado and Wyoming that we
affectionately refer to as Go Pig. If we did the full
title, it would be "Go pig-guck-guck-wah." And that
doesn't work too well, so Go Pig.

Go Pig actually is a group that started in
1993. It grew out of the Colorado alliance with
research libraries, government documents committee and
the Colorado alliance of research libraries decided
that we were a bunch of troublemakers and they threw us
out. So we then formed our own group and began moving
around meeting in depositories around the state.
Essentially, I set the agenda for every meeting, but if
anybody has anything they want to suggest, I let them
put it on. But we would provide regular updates of
what was going on with the FDLP and then when anyone

who goes to a meeting, ALA [indecipherable] or anything
comes back and gives us the report on that. And I try
to have some sort of presentation or training at every
meeting. And essentially we meet on a monthly basis.

We're really sort of fortunate geographically
here in that most of the population in Colorado is
along the front range. So between Pueblo and Fort
Collins really is where most the depositories are. And
then again as regional for Wyoming, we've got people in
Laramie and Cheyenne who come to our meetings also, and
then some of the other people will make a longer trip.

Usually once a year I try to hold a multi-day
meeting devoted primarily to training. So, we usually
call these our road trips and go some place a little
further away and spend the night and have a lot of fun.
A couple of years ago we went to Grand Junction. We
had I think 17 or 18 depository libraries from the
front range go to Grand Junction to meet with the one
depository library in there, but she was very nice and
took us on a tour of the wineries in Grand Junction
that evening. And so they do have very nice wineries
in Grand Junction, yes.

So with the training that I try to put on in
Go Pig, they're primarily done by depository librarians
-- a lot by myself, a lot by my staff. That's one of

the things I actually tell people when I hire them in
the interview that you will be called upon to make
regular presentations in Go Pig meetings.
Occasionally, we will meet at a federal agency or at a
federal library or we'll invite agency staff to come to
our meetings. We are fortunate here in that Denver has
the highest number of federal agencies residing in it
outside of Washington, D.C., so there's a lot of
resources that we can call on here.

      However, my experience is that usually the
depository librarians do a much better job of training
other depository librarians than agency staff. And
that, you know, that's just not in all cases, and the
Census Bureau does a terrific job.

      Those agencies who have training programs do
very well, but those without formal programs often
don't quite understand the audience. And an example of
this is an agency in Denver that they had revised their
website greatly and provided a lot more resources, a
lot more databases and a lot of the depository
librarians were thinking it would be helpful to get
some sort of, you know, guidance and training on their
new website.

      So I agreed to invite someone from the agency
to come to our next meeting. We contacted them, they

agreed. We talked to them very much about who their
audience was; who we were and what we were hoping to
get. And despite this, I was not real optimistic that
we were going to get what we wanted. I was also in the
planning of our full-day training session we were going
to have at Grand Junction. So when the group of the
planning committee for that function got together, I
suggested the two of them actually plan on revisiting
this agency and redoing and giving us the presentation
that we really wanted.

So, as it turned out, the presentation from
the agency by everyone's admittance was pretty
disappointing. They really did not understand who they
were talking to; that we were information specialists
who had a really firm base of what their agency did and
we just wanted more. We wanted more of the really
specialized stuff, and this person that was talking to
us really didn't know it himself. So the presentation
from the depository librarians really did understand
that and really could address our needs much better
than the agency did. So that really sort of helped
form my idea of what we wanted to do in training and
other areas.

Another training opportunity we have out here
is the five-state government documents conference.

This is something that grew out of a joint meeting

first between Arizona and New Mexico, and then Janet

Fisher decided that she wanted to take the Rocky

Mountains and so invited Utah, Nevada and Colorado to

participate in a session in Flagstaff.

And when she contacted me, I, you know, she

said, is there an interest in Colorado to coming to

this, and I had to say, "No, not really. We do a lot

of our own meetings and training."

What Janet's situation and others in this

area -- a lot of small depositories, very

geographically dispersed that don't normally get to go

to national conferences, so the idea of having

something on a regional basis that these people could

get to was very appealing to a lot of them, not quite

as much in Colorado.

Janet then sort of tricked me and the next

thing I knew, she sent out an agenda and I was on it

five times, so I had to go. And I was extremely glad

that I did, because it really was a terrific

conference. It was in 2000. We had about 45 people

showed up for this. So because it was a great success,

we decided to do it again.

The next one was in Santa Fe in 2004. We had

about 95 people registered for that, and Richard was a

terrific host. It was a really, really fun time.
Santa Fe was a great place to do it. So we then met
again in Boulder in 2006.

Basically all of these were pretty much the
same that they were a combination of presentations from
agencies, from depository librarians. We had a few
faculty from library schools.

My favorite presentation at the Boulder
conference was I asked one the City of Boulder history
faculty who happened to a couple of years before chair
the state department committee that selected material
for the foreign relations of the U.S. series. And this
was a fascinating presentation. You know giving us a
behind-the-scenes look at what went into that.

So these meetings have been really very
successful. We had about 130 registrants in Boulder.
We drew from a larger population base in Colorado
obviously, so I had a lot of non-depository librarians
who registered, many of them who came for just parts of
the conference. It was a two and a half day
conference, and so they looked at the agenda and just
picked things that they wanted to attend and came to
that.

We had a really strong attendance from
library school students, part which I attribute to

Chris Brown telling his class that they could get out of writing a paper if they came to the conference.

But it really was very great. It was really neat having those library students, because they came in and they participated, got in our discussions and asked, you know, really interesting questions. So I was really glad we had expanded in that area too.

In 2008, we're looking at the possibility of Utah. It's not everything is finalized there, but I think, you know, we're got something going here that has really worked out well, and we will be continuing it.

The next thing that I got involved with in terms of training was a proposal to GPO for a consultant. And this was a plan that they had a couple of years ago to place a GPO employee or a consultant into regionals or interregional that was serving a group of other states that I think it was based like trying to serve around 100 depositories. So what I proposed is that there would be GPO consultant based at the University of Colorado and would provide training to depository librarians in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming.

Some of you with a sharp eye might notice that, you know, we've got five states here. It's not

quite the same five states that we had at the five-state conference. We sort of are hedging a bit when we talk about which five states we're talking about often. There were some funding problems with this and in any case I was told "Yes, you do have the position." And then "No, you don't." "Yes, you do." And eventually it didn't happen.

There was a pilot project with one position funded but essentially I had already gone out and talked with the regionals and others and came up with this plan. So later when the University of Colorado, the libraries, hired a grant writer, I sort of had the foundation of what I wanted to talk to her about already done.

So in April of 2005, the University of Colorado hired Liz Bishoff as a grant writer. And some of you may be familiar with Liz from her activities in the ALA, from her work at OCLC and she also was the head of the Colorado digitization project where she was very successful with writing grants. So we were extremely fortunate to be able to hire her.

When she came in, she asked to see library faculty to fill out a survey about what they were interested in terms of grants and possibles for pursuing a grant. So I filled this out, and it really

surprised me in that I have a real strong interest in digitization. I've had a long interest in retrospective cataloging, but as I filled out this grant, I found the thing that I was saying that my top primary interest was training good government documents librarians.

So Liz and I got together to discuss the grant possibilities, and I essentially told her what I just told you about what I've been doing and the different opportunities we had, the cooperation. Liz took all that, went back and started looking up the grant possibilities, and then came back and said, "Okay. I think the Laura Kay Bush Librarians and 21st Century grant is a strong possibility for us. This is really a grant that is aimed at library schools to develop new curriculums, but one of the lower priorities was actually developing training for librarians. So we decided we could really go.

One of the things about Liz and I is that we're both dreamers. We dream big. So we immediately knew that we had to expand our work, and we formed a planning committee and invited two other Colorado depository librarians to join us, Chris Brown at the University of Denver, and many of you may know him, and Chris has one of the most creative minds for

technological uses of government information. McKinley Sielaff [phonetic]. McKinley can scream like a teenager at a Beatle's concert, which she did yesterday.

So we started meeting and discussing what we wanted to do with the grant, and we really decided that we wanted to build on the five-state conference and the GPO consultant, so to have something that wasn't multi-state, which meant that we then expanded our planning committee.

The first thing we did was invite other regionals from the five states, so Janet Fisher from the Arizona State Library of Public Records and Archives, Laurie Canneba [phonetic] from New Mexico State Library, Dan Barkley from the University of New Mexico.

Since I'm the regional for Wyoming, we invited Venice Besky [phonetic] from the Wyoming State Library to be part of it. We did invite the Utah regional, but he was involved with business or a building move and several other things, so he said he couldn't participate in the planning committee, but he did want to participate in the grant though.

We also wanted to avoid duplication of anything that GPO might be doing, and we wanted them to know what we doing, so we invited Robin Haun-Mohamed

to join us.

And after we had a couple of our conference
calls and we were proceeding along, we realized that it
really would be nice to have a little bit more of the
public library perspective, so Susan Simmons of the
Mamie Dowd Eisenhower Public Library of Bloomfield,
Colorado joined us.

Throughout this process, the idea of what we
were trying to do, you know, evolve as we held a lot of
discussions, a lot of conference calls, initially my
idea in doing the grant was to train depository
librarians. They would be the primary audience. But
as we discussed the growth of information on the web,
the transition, the FDLP to prominent dominantly
electronic program, we really came to believe came to
believe that we needed to reach out and train non-
depository librarians as well.

I really saw that there were two primary
issues of electronic government information that were
affecting what we were trying to do. First, with the
reduction and distribution of tangible products to the
FDLP, there were going to be changes in the depository
libraries, some of which we have already seen -- a lot
of processing staff is being shifted to other duties, a
lot of library deans and directors are saying well

they're not getting much new material, we really should
start looking at reducing the size of our depository
collections. And then, of course, is the, you know,
the real question, what is the role of the depository
librarians in the future. So what can our grant do to
answer that question.

The second is with the growth of internet
publishing by government agencies, non-deposit
libraries have access to government information and no
longer need to refer patrons to the depository
libraries. But that doesn't mean that they're not
referring.

Many non-depository librarians are still
reluctant to use government information. There is
still that fear of government documents that I think
has been taught for many years in our library schools
and has passed on from senior librarians to newer
librarians. And so basically there's a lack of
expertise and training with government information.

So referrals are still being made to
depository libraries, but the referrals are not so much
to the collection any more as they are referrals to the
expertise of the depository librarian.

So what we're looking at in this grant is the
depository librarian as a trainer. I strongly believe

that one of the main roles -- one of the future roles for depository librarians is to train other librarians in the use of electronic government information.

And the goal of our grant is to help depository librarians make the transition from being custodian of a government document collection to being government information trainers.

One of the things that we really built into our plan was having training modules that were gathered together in one site, the material that could be used by our trainers when they went out and trained non-depository librarians. And as we were discussing that we really planned that anything that we developed would be something that would be made available to the whole depository library community.

And this seems like a very fine line, but the training modules would be aimed at libraries. It's not necessary training modules that were aimed at doing presentations for library patrons or the general public. It would be the depository librarians that we were aiming this at.

It was interesting at last fall's DLC meeting and at one of the discussions going on about the needs of depository librarian for training, that it was mentioned by one of the council members that what we

really need is some sort of central repository where all this could go. Hey, we're doing that, you know.

GPO actually offered to host the training modules, but as we discussed, you know, what are needs were and everything, we felt that GPO was really ready to give us the sort of system that we needed.

As I said, Liz Bishoff had previously worked at OCLC. She was familiar with Web Junction, so we had several conference calls with people from Web Junction. And if you're not familiar with Web Junction, it's an online community for library staff offering resources, courses and communications. So, we really felt that this would be one way that even though it was something that we would have to pay to use, we would try to insure that everything we put up on it would be available freely to everyone.

So, to sum up, you know, our plan was that in the first year, we would develop a train the trainers conference with the lesson modules and get everything up on the Web Junction. Depository libraries participants would help prioritize what lesson modules we'd be doing. We'd participate in the train the trainers conference, and then would work with the state coordinator to develop a state-level training plan.

And then in year two, we would center on the

participating states' training program implementation.
Although everyone comes Boulder first, we train them in
our train the trainer program.

We have some sessions on, you know, working
with adult education, looking at all the modules we
prepared. And the depository librarian would be
involved in at least two training sessions or workshops
in their state. Essentially, that's the contract.
We're bringing them to Boulder for this training. So
in part of their exchange of taking part in the train
the trainers conference, they're agreeing that they
will go back to their state and do it at least two
training sessions and my hope is that they will be
doing a whole lot more than just two, but that's the
minimum that we're requiring.

There will be a program evaluation, and then
we hope that we're going to be able to develop Web
Junction's online community, and there'll be a lot more
communications and discussions about the grant.

Now as I laid in bed at 5:30 this morning
running through this presentation, I realized there was
a couple of slides that I did leave out. One of them
had to do with a focus group that we held at the
Colorado Association of Libraries, because we were
talking a lot about, you know, how we're going to be

reaching out to try to train non-depository librarians. And in our mind we're really talking primarily public librarians.

And so we decided we really need to talk to public librarians more, so we invited public library directors in Colorado to come to us and sit down and talk about what they felt their needs were for training for their public service staff for government information. And we had a nice -- it wasn't a very, you know, large turnout because there's a lot of things that could draw people to these conferences, so I was very pleased with the turnout we got. We got some really good things that we actually quoted in the grand proposal with the concerns of these people.

One of the ones that was really influential to me was a woman from a very small public library in rural Colorado who said that, you know, she heard us talk about what we'd probably be doing in training at the state conferences, and she was saying that she really cannot send her staff to these conferences, because she has so few staff that, you know, she can't afford for them to be away from the library. She has to close the library really if her staff is going to be away for any length of time. So that if we could come to them. We wouldn't have to come to their library,

but come some place close by where they could go easily
and it wouldn't really affect the library's hours that
much. That would be the ideal for them. Otherwise,
they would not be able to participate.

So we realize we had to be really aggressive
in our training and reaching out, so built into the
grant was the idea that we have some funds to pay for
our trainers to go where the people who need to be
trained are and not demanding that they come to us.
But on the other hand, if they will come to us, we're
going to give them a stipend to pay for their expenses
to try to make them as enticing as possible to draw in
the non-depository people who normally do not deal with
government information.

So, we heard in June that we got this grant,
and the initial exhilaration fades, I realize, oh, my
God, I've actually got to do this now.

So the first really important decision that I
had to make was hiring a project manager, because we'd
written this into the grant and this was going to be
someone who was going to be doing a lot of the real
nitty-gritty work on this grant. And I can honestly
say that the best decision I made and that my greatest
accomplishment really up to this point was convincing
Kirsten Clark to leave Las Cruces and come to Boulder

and is going to be here working on this grant. So I'm

going to turn it over to Kirsten now to talk about what

she's been doing the last few months.

KIRSTEN CLARK: Yes, when Tim said that he

and Liz were dreamers of it, I was like, you know,

that's great. You need dreamers, but you also need the

practical how in the hell are we going to do this, and

that's pretty much what my job has been since

September.

When I think of the grant of what we're

accomplishing with it, it's really kind of melded all

together in my mind. So as I was trying to think of

how to present this to you all as people that haven't

been a part of the process, I decided probably we

should just start talking about the conference, because

this is really the big piece of the first year.

There's actually two of them, one being the

conference and the other being the modules. Just so

you all know, there is a handout in the packet that is

just a brief overview. In fact I think it includes the

two slides that Tim just showed on what the grant's

about. It also has our contact information on it as

well, so that's in your packet.

So, as you can see here, June 6th through the

8th -- it'll be coming up in a couple of months --

we're doing this train the trainer conference here in
Colorado and inviting -- at this point we have 48
librarians from the five-state area coming to be a part
of -- to attend this and learn to be a trainer of other
librarians.

The grant is about 35 pages long -- 50 pages
-- it's a large grant. And so from my -- one of the
few things from when I first started was to kind of
piece it out and what exactly do we need to do? How do
we actually accomplish this very grand, very great
idea. And one of the things that came out of this is
what exactly is this conference going to be about?
What is train the trainer?

I think we're all -- and this is a question
that has come up a lot of times and people ask you know
when -- especially from the people coming to the
conference -- what exactly are we going to be doing
there? The idea is and I think that all of us that
have been through library school and the thing that has
really talked to us is we're here to help the patron.
We're here to get that information to the person.
Where this conference -- the switch on this is we're
here necessarily to help the patron one-on-one; we're
here to help our colleagues to help the patron. And
that's really that key -- and you think it's something

that should just come naturally, but you really have to sit there and think about it; what we're looking at and as we're developing this, it's really to help the person down the street at the libraries or the person sitting next to us at the reference desk. That's what we're aiming this for.

So I want you to kind of have that concept. There's a couple of things we want to include in the training for the conference of how do we help a depository librarian that is coming and is going to be attending this conference to understand and to use those concepts to go out and then train other librarians.

One of the key things is this overview of the e-government. You know for all of us, I think we can do that and hands down, we deal with it all the time. But think of other public librarians, as Tim stated, in a small rural library. E-government is this concept that's out here. What does that really mean for me? And so we want to make sure in the conference that we're kind of talking about that. What is this whole idea of e-government?

As Tim also mentioned, we want to talk about adult learning, and we're bringing Deborah Greeley, who is the dean of the library school at the University of

Denver who is getting her Ph.D. right now in adult
learning. How do, as a librarian, how do I train
adults? And it was really interesting in the council
aerobics that 75 percent of the room stood up when
academic libraries was mentioned. What is our main
clientele of academic librarians? It's the students.
And there's a very different way of addressing and
teaching a student than there is an adult. Now, most
of the libraries that are coming to the conference, the
depositories, librarians are from academic libraries.
How do we show them how to train adults? And so that's
going to be a key piece.

There is the piece of using Web Junction, as
Tim mentioned. Web Junction is main conduit of
information for the training sessions. How do we use
that particular -- the software and the site to its
fullest ability, and I'll show that one a little bit
later.

There's teaching the modules. We are
developing these training modules. And this isn't
necessarily, you know, how do you do legal information;
that's one of the modules. But how do you train
someone to use this particular module to then answer
legal questions?

And there's the state training plans. We

setting aside some time at the conference for each

state to get together and to talk about what is going

to be the best way for them in their state to get these

training sessions done. Now you think we have 48

people. They each have to do at least two training

sessions. That's 100 training sessions. How do we

make sure that everybody has a chance, and we're not

just throwing these -- come to the conference and now

you have to go back and figure out how to do your

training. No, we want to have a plan in place so that

people, the trainers, are feeling as though they're a

part of this whole process. And they know that we're

in -- we want to make sure that the entire state is

being covered so that places, for instance, we say

Colorado has a lot of the depositories on the front

range. We want to make sure that the entire State of

Colorado has the ability to attend one of these

sessions. So that's part of the training that's going

to happen at the conference.

        And when I say conference attendees, what are

we talking about? Obviously we have this system

already in place at FDLP. Let's look at depositories

that are in these states -- a great place to pull our

trainers from, the people that know the government

information. But we also wanted to make sure that the

person that came from that depository was someone that
actually did training. In some cases, where you have a
depository librarian that's more [indecipherable] than
technical services, that's really great, that's fine,
but we're talking about training here. We want
somebody that's comfortable with training that
understands what we're trying to get across with the
training, and so we just wanted to make sure as we
pulled the attendees from the various depositories that
they really understood what we're wanting to do here.

Another key piece, and this is a question
that came up quite a bit was are you really sure you're
paying for this. Our institution doesn't have to put
some money into this. And it's exactly as Tim said, we
don't want this to be a financial burden on the
institutions. The grant is paying for this. We want
to get the people here so that we can train them. And
this is not only for the conference itself, but we're
also -- the grant is also paying for the attendees of
the conference to go out and do that training.

So for instance, I'll use Las Cruces since I
know the area, New Mexico State University, if they
wanted to do a training session in Deming which is
about an hour away, we would pay for the travel
expenses for them to go there. So there's that.

There's also that requirement of at least two
training sessions and workshops. And I say between
July 2007 and September 2008, obviously the conference
is in June, so we had -- and the 2008 is based on the
end of the grant. That's when the fiscal year ends.

So there is this two training sessions in
we're looking at 14 months; that's really not that much
to ask. And then there's also the piece of the
conference attendees contributing to the state level
point. We want them to be involved, because they know
their area. They know the questions that they're
getting and the potential questions. Again, I can use
Las Cruces as an example.

New Mexico State University is the
depository, but there's a very large public library,
but we're going to have the same types of questions
coming to both of us.

This is just a breakdown of the attendees by
state. You'll notice Utah. Well, we're working on
that, but we're having a pretty nice representation
across all five states.

So another question I've gotten a lot is what
exactly are we talking about with this module. What is
this training module? And I like to use the example of
anybody that's done a library instruction for me since

I've worked at universities I think of a library instruction I would do for a class. So the one I used to do at NMSU was demographics related to the health industry. It was for one of the nursing classes. When I did that class, I would create a web page. I'd have a link of resources. I'd have a handout. In essence, I created a mini-module, a mini-training module with those resources. And that module could be used by somebody else or I could revamp it. It's the same concept but in a much broader, larger scale. We want these modules to cover a broad subject topic. So instead of demographics in nursing, I'm looking at just demographics overall.

We also want to allow for different types of training. Again, as an example, in New Mexico, we have a lot of very small libraries that don't necessarily have a training room set aside for people to have hands-on training. It might be one computer up in front of the room, whereas, again at the university, I have a very nice setup. We need to have this material and this training module to be useful across a variety of types of training.

We also need to allow the trainers to choose what they want to train on. Do we want to cover just briefly several different modules so they just need a

little bit of kind of a survey in some ways of that
particular topic, or do we really want to go into depth
on demographics and really look for whatever reason
perhaps at the health industry because that's the
particular training session they wanted. We need to
have that granularity in types of training materials.

There also needs to be standardization so
that when one person learns one module, they can go to
the next module and not be looking at it going now
where do I go. We want to have a standard layout so
you learn on one, you can use any of them.

And also as we're creating these kind of
draft initial modules, they're going to change as we do
a training. You have 100 different training sessions,
it's going to change. People are going to say, "You
know, that doesn't work; why don't we do this. Hey,
let's add this piece here. This was really great.
Let's expand on that." We need to have the ability to
add and add onto these particular training modules.

So I've been talking about these modules,
what have we done in terms of getting some stuff up
there. Initially, we decided we just needed to get a
list of topics, some general topics. And I'm going to
show them in a second.

This list was developed by the planning

committee. And Tim has mentioned most of the members. About the time I got there, there was two other members that were added, and that was Jennie Gerkey [phonetic] from the University of Colorado at Boulder, and at the time, Frank Milmont who was also at that time was at Colorado. They became part of the planning committee as well.

So we developed this initial list of topics. We then did a survey of the depository libraries in the five-state area and said here's -- and there's 21 topics we came up -- you rank these 21 topics and tell us what you think are the most important. The main reason being there's no way we're going to get 21 topics created and modules created by the time of the conference. We decided we could get probably of them done, so we needed to know what your top 10 are.

Also as part of that survey, we started to ask for volunteers from the five states, and it turned out to beyond. We went outside the region though for volunteers who were interested in being a part of one of these module development teams. Actually I was going to ask anybody that's on a module development team to please stand. Come on, I can't see you all out there.

We would not -- [applause] yes -- clap. Bow

down to them.

We would have absolutely nothing to show if it was not for these people. They have been volunteering their time to pull this information together, and for some of them, some of the modules are a little bit further along, so I asked them actually to get information to me sooner than I originally planned. I'd asked for the modules to be completed by April 29th, and I actually moved it up three weeks for some people so we'd have something to show you all at this conference. And a lot of people really jumped on that and really did a lot of work, so there's actually something in Web Junction to show.

We have these volunteers. We just had three to five people per team so that got us several different viewpoints on a particular topic, but it was still small enough that people could work together.

So what are the topics? I'm not going to read this. You guys can read it.

These are the top ten, and it was very interesting. There was a clear-cut line between the top 10 and the next 10 that came up. And in fact the top two demographics [indecipherable] were by far the most interested, were ranked one, two or three. We asked them to rank the top five, and those two were

really clear-cut ones at the top, and then rest pretty much fell into a row.

And then we have the rest. And [indecipherable] in here August 2007, our plan is we're going to those 10 for the conference, and then over the rest of the summer, we're going to -- and I think we arbitrarily picked August 17th, because it's the day before classes start at C at Boulder -- I don't know why -- as they have the second round done.

Also keep in mind that we want to have all 21 modules available for when the training starts so that we're not locked into just those 10, but we do need something for the conference, and that's those 10 that we just talked about.

So module development: Those of us at CU, so Tim, Jennie, Frank and I, we decided there's still this kind of nebulous cloud of what a module really is, and we have all these people really willing to help, but really what are they doing to do. So we decided to create a test module, and we used demographics. We were really lucky, all four of us are at the same institution, but most of the module teams are across states. In fact I think one of them has people in four different states. So it's how do we create a model for those people to use that is going to allow them to be

collaborating across these long distances. And it's actually I think because of the Go Pig training and McKinley I think said this showing a wickee [phonetic] that she created that we're like duh, let's use a wickee So we created a wickee for demographic information as a way for us just within C at Boulder to pull together our resources and have a place for us to see what other people are thinking of what we're doing, and it's also if anybody's used a wickee, we can post files. You can post the links. It's a really resource.

A key piece for myself and Jennie, who helped me with loading things, it was really easy for us to go these freely open public wickees to pull the information off so that we could put it into Web Junction. There's no people e-mailing us files or them putting it on a server and us having to FTP it and all that. We're able to pull it right off of this.

So this is just an example of the one that we did for the test module, which leads into Web Junction. So we created this test module and we needed to get it into Web Junction, so the people, the other module teams, could see what we were planning to do. I actually started out this slide with the two faces of Web Junction, but I thought that sounded kind of like

the good and evil, and that's not what I was going for

here. More of the two interfaces -- there's the online

committee, the library staff, and that's what we see

when you go to Webjunction.org. It's that public

interface. But there's this piece behind it.

Everything that shows up on that page is developed in a

content management system that's on the back side.

They're using a product called Rivnex [phonetic]. It's

vastly different. It's -- I don't know how many people

have used content management systems before, but it

takes a little getting used to.

          And that's actually the second part of this

is when we're developing the modules, there's a

content. And again you get over 30 people developing

content, you also have different types of those topics.

How you develop a module for legal information is going

to be very different than how you're going to develop

one for energy. So we have that in there. We have all

these different people contributing to this. Each

person has their own teaching style, has their own font

that they like to use and their training material has

their own way of looking at that topic, so we have kind

of the -- probably a large creative body of information

there, but with the content management system, we have

a very structured configuration as to how that

information can go in and how it's going to look in Web

Junction.

And as I mentioned before, we asked a lot of

the modules to get this information to us, and Jennie

and I have -- just to give you an idea -- we've added

over 400 files over the past probably two months. To

take what they've given us and to put into the system

and have it look the way they want it to look, it's not

happening. It's a something we hadn't really thought

about. And that's one of the concerns that we're

dealing with that we need to get in place before we

start moving on to the other modules.

So there's this very structured piece that

we're dealing with on the back end to show what's

coming forward on the public end.

So what -- oh, okay. And I just I'm -- we're

going to go into Web Junction. I did some canned

screen shots due to internet problems I was seeing

yesterday, so it's going to be a little hard I think to

visualize what I'm showing you as [inaudible] to the

page, but it's kind of the best I think we can do.

But I also -- I want to say this is very much

in the rough draft stage. We got a lot of information

up there, but I will tell you you're going to find

typos and links that don't work, because Web Junction

does not have a test server. The only way we can look
at this information and see if it's working and have
the module teams that gave us the information to look
at it and say, "Hey, I really like that." "No, you
totally destroyed my whole concept on what I was trying
to do" -- is for us to actually put it up live in Web
Junction.

So it's kind of we have our bad face forward
a little bit, so keep that in mind as you're looking at
these slides and looking at it on your own time. The
link to our website is in the handout.

So with that -- saying that, here we have the
front page. I don't know how many of you have been in
Web Junction. The page you're looking at is pretty
much kind of the style sheet for Web Junction as a
whole. The year of it is in -- if there's one thing
you take away from this presentation, I'd like it to be
this URL, because this is the place for this grant.
Not only is it talking about the conference, but this
is where the modules are; this is where the information
is going to be. As I say, it is on the handout in very
small print I realize now.

But you also can get to it from the library
from the home page of Web Junction which is the
webjunction.org. You can see at the top -- that top

tool bar in the white where it says "Resources," if you click on that, you'll pull up a list of different resources and government information of the 21st century is one of the those.

The GI-21, government information, [inaudible] told me how to be a cute little thing that people would remember.

You'll notice a little grid logo stuck in the middle. Jennie and I were working on that last week, and we need to fiddle around with it. This would be one of those rough draft things that is going to get -- the format's going to get a little bit better.

So here we have the front page. You can immediately jump into the modules from this page which is really nice. On the left bar where I have the star, it's -- I have a feeling it's very hard to read from the screen, because it's hard to read from the laptop as well. We have the listing of the modules on that left part, so people can immediately go to this page and jump into a particular area of interest that they have.

We also have up there at the top is about the program which is right next to the star, and on this page is we were pulling together the things that do not relate to the modules, the information in the modules,

so information about the grant, contact information.

Here's also where we have the participating libraries. Those libraries that are sending trainers to the conference are listed here. We also have trainer profiles which will be more robust once the trainer starts sending me their profiles. Hint, hint.

But you'll be able to click on there and see the people. I think to me this is a key piece of the whole social interactivity of Web Junction is here's a face to go with a name of the trainer. I also think it's going to be a great way for when people start hearing about this program in the public library to go "Who's the trainer in my area?" They can pull up that page and see the people they might want to contact.

And the module development teams are listed there. We do have some news. Others are now coming about every other month, and this just kind of gives some history. They're created to be sent to the depository librarians and the directors of the depository libraries to kind of keep that connection between the people that are in charge of the whole place and the ones that are in the part of the depository.

So that's -- if you're interested in the newsletters, they're going to be posted here directly.

As I said before, we have these modules. There's a piece of this we need to keep that standardization between each module. And this is really something I started with and worked with the planning committee on, but there's also a piece of this that is very specific to Web Junction, and we'll get to that in a second.

So with each module what we wanted to do is create this using the module place. How do you use this module? In putting this information up, how do you walk somebody through using this particular information. We also wanted to have a table of contents. What is available on this module? We wanted some training materials that people are going to be using in these training sessions. And we all wanted that kind of on the front page. That's what you're going to see when you come in.

The key resources in [inaudible], those are things that are specific to Web Junction and I'm going to get to those in a second.

The thing to keep in mind with these modules is that we are really -- our concentration is on training, because one of the things that has come up is this is available to anybody that comes to Web Junction. It's out there, and in fact somebody did a

search on legal information and this was the sixth set
that came up was the legal information module. So the
information is out there, but we're really focusing on
the training aspect of it.

So we have this using the module which goes
through and describes the different areas. I know you
guys probably really can't see this. But it talks
about those different areas that were on that previous
slide, the pieces of the module template.

The other thing that we've added on here is
this is very brief and wanted it brief, so it kind of
showed at the top of the page, but there is a link to
something that is a much more robust guide through this
particular module. And there's a link to a step-by-
step using the demographics module. They are for
people that want more information.

Now again the key of this we're using -- this
is being used within the training session, so this is
real time; it's going to be part of it, not just
something that people are going to go back to after the
training session is done. They can if they want, but
it's going to be integrated into the training.

We have that content module contents that we
were talking about or had mentioned earlier. In
essence, this is a table of contents. But again

thinking back to my example of the demographic

information in nursing, there's those pieces of

training that I had, that web page, a list of

resources, websites, a handout. That is what is in

this table of contents. This is that piecemeal, things

that we are related to demographics, a guide to the

census home page for those of you that can't read it,

and I'm having trouble too.

American Fact Finder, Guide to American Fact

Finder, American Community Survey, we have some case

studies up there, and there's some subjects, specific

guides, for people who are interested directly in crime

demographics, they can click on that.

To me this is like the smorgasbord. You have

a trainer that comes in and they look through this.

I'm doing a training session on demographics. What are

the things that I want to cover? I have an hour. I

have a half a day, again, that different types of

training. What are the pieces I want to pull together

to be a part of my training?

The training material side we need to come up

with a new name for it, but what we're putting there is

in essence I'm the trainer; I've pulled those pieces

together; I create a PowerPoint; I create an agenda; I

create an outline of my training. That's the type of

thing that's going to go into the training materials.
It's kind of the composite of all those pieces I've
picked off the smorgasbord to pull together and make it
into this complete module, or this complete training
session, the idea being that that is posted there --
the next person to do that training session can use
that material as well. We're not reinventing the
wheel. Somebody has created this training material,
this training agenda for the session. Somebody else
can use it, or I think -- and this is the example I
use, somebody creates a general demographics one, again
using Las Cruces as an example, the majority of the
population there is Hispanic. Someone could take that
general overview training session that somebody did and
make it specific to the Hispanic population. They can
post that up so that someone in Arizona or another
person in New Mexico can use that training session
again, so again building this community and building
this material and being able to add to it.

        We have these key resources and by far this
is the biggest question I get is what are the key
resources. What is this list? This is I'll call it
the quirk of Web Junction. This is something that they
have set up. And for what they have done, I should
mention that Web Junction has never done a project of

this scale. So while we're learning how this is going
to work and how this going to be in Web Junction,
they're learning as well. And we're coming to them
saying, "This isn't working. What can we do about it?"
And they are really great at coming and saying, "Okay,
we're going to figure this out. We're going to figure
out how to get you what you want. Because obviously I
think they want to use this for other groups later on.
This is kind of a piece of their marketing I guess you
would say.

So what we have here is this key resources.
Basically all this is is a listing of what was in that
table of contents. Each one of those items in that
table of contents is a file. It went into the content
management system. The contact management system we
say these are the files that associated with
demographics. The web page and the content management
system talk to each other. They say okay, these are
the files that were added. The demographics, we're
going to pull that together and create this list of key
resources. And that's how it is. It's just you can
click on these and it pulls up the same files that you
found in the table of contents. The reason we put --
we could have just used that straight, but if you look
-- if you could see this list, we cannot put these in

any particular order. We technically could, but it causes a lot of problems. And I can explain to anyone that wants to hear more. It's a long story.

But all we can really do is create this list. And in essence it's based on when the file was added to the system. So when something's updated, it's going to bump it to the top of the list. So we created the table of contents to give people an outline to walk through. So you're not just looking at this list going "Okay, where the heck do I go now." But because this is a piece of Web Junction, we cannot do anything about the key resources that's going to be there.

The other piece that is associated with Web Junction is the C-OSSO [phonetic], and all this is is a listing. Each one of these websites and the abstract is another file, which is really great when for instance the Bureau of the Census if there was five different modules that wanted to have the Bureau of the Census listed in their C-OSSO. It's very -- we put the file in once. We can link it to all those different pages. From the content management side, it's a great idea.

For us within Web Junction, what we're trying to figure out is this is at the very bottom of the page. We've already scrolled through two pages. How

we're going to use this and what are we going to put in this particular area. But the idea is that these are -- when you think of demographics, these are the top resources that we're going to send people to.

Fitting in. As we've been added, as I said, we've added over 400 files. We're trying to figure out how to take these concepts that we have in terms of what we want the modules to do. How do we make it work in Web Junction? And I just want to list some of these because as you look at the page again because the live servers, our test server, you're going to see us working through some of these issues.

One of the things that has come up is multiple versions of the same document. Going back to that concept of we want this training to be as useful for as many people, what do you do when you have a training session that has no internet access or has limited internet access. We're going to want a handout. If there's a session that's in a classroom, we're going to want hands on, so we're going to need a handout in one particular case for research. We're going to need a web page so that people can go in and click on those resources and use it interactively.

And again, I'd kind of like you to see this, but with the -- if you look at the citizenship and

immigration module, when you have a chance, what we've

done on this page is we've listed each resource, and we

actually have a link to the two different types of

information. So there's a link to the web doc -- or

sorry, to the word doc and a link to the web page. We

need to find out if this is going to work or not, but

we don't know.

But we thought of this as a way to again

provide the opportunity for the trainer to use the

materials in the best way they see fit. And I just --

you'll notice this says using your state's geography

which really has nothing to do with demographics or

citizenship, but this is -- I was making my screen

shots, and I took some slides out, so not everything's

matching, but I wanted to show you when you click on

the word doc, what happens. It pulls up this file and

asks you to download a file, and then it pulls up the

document much like you would with any other website.

But if you were to click on the web page, you -- it's a

one click that pulls up this -- pulls up the web page.

Another thing we're dealing with is that the

content management system has its own HTML out of there

which has been a little fun of having to turn all the

pages in the wickees into text and then having to mark

them up again. That's been really, really fun. But

there's again that's something we're working around.

So that goes into what we need to talk with the module teams and see what's going to be the best way to get the information across so we're not having to do things double. But this is what happens when you click on the web page. You in essence get this particular format.

We're also having an interesting look at sub-topics. How much information is too much information on a page so we don't end up with 14-page long Web Junction page. As you look in here and you can kind of tell the pages are really broken up into various pieces, and so we're already -- you don't get the full width of the page. We're already being marked down to a half or to a third. Add into that that you have, you know, 20 URL's with their abstracts, you're getting a very long page.

So we're trying to figure how we want to take these larger topics -- in this case, legal information and break it down into some manageable sub-topics. In this case, legal did one on intellectual property. It's actually a very easy topic to break down with the various types of information, copyright, trademark and patent and so forth. And actually that web page I pulled up just previously is the copyright link here.

If you look over on the left where the star is, this is where you're getting the differentiation that this is a sub-topic and it's not that big a differentiation. It's indented a little. So we're trying to figure out how we can fit that in. How do we let people know that we're on this sub-topic page; that there's a larger module available as well. But we still want to get enough content in there that it makes it useable for training and for, you know, training of the non-depository librarian for that librarian to come back and look at this material and reuse it, and key resources in C-OSSO for that.

So next steps -- I have to get past all those slides I deleted. What are we doing next? First off, is the best practices for adding [inaudible]. Now that we've added so many files, Jennie and I are next week getting together to figure out from our standpoint of having added the file what's working and what's not, and then we need to talk to the module teams and get an idea from them how they feel about the information that's been put up and what we need to change, so that for the next round, we have something in place. There's more of an outline there.

We're also doing state surveys of the non-depository libraries. We did that survey initially to

find out what top 10 modules we wanted to develop

first. We want to find out from the people that are

going to be coming to the training what they consider

to be their topics of interest. And so each state is

developing a survey.

It was interesting, I was talking to Janet at

lunch the other day and there's has been out for a

couple of days, and pretty much what people are putting

as their top ten are the top 10 modules that we're

developing for the conference. So, I'm like "Yea. We

guessed right."

But we're doing that for all the states so we

can pull that information. And that information is

also going to be used in the state training plan. So

we're getting the input from the people that are going

to be trained. We do need to finish the [inaudible]

modules. I've given the date of April 29th that's not

going to be met. But we will have them done by the

June conference so that that's available there.

We're also working on the evaluation and

developing that. As part of the grant, we have our

outcome based evaluation percentages. You know 85

percent after training say that they find government

information understandable or very understandable.

We're needing to develop the pre-imposed test

for that. And the piece I haven't really thought about
is technically we are doing human research, so it has
to go by the human research committee of the University
of Colorado at Boulder, so we're having some fun with
that.

Since we're tying the information, we are
actually tying the information to a name so that we --
to a number that's associated with a name so we can
compare the before and after. But we're also meeting
to develop evaluation not only for the conference how
that's with the trainers, but also for each one of
those state level trainees. And we're trying to figure
out a way to automate, because as was mentioned, I am
going to the University of Minnesota, but we'll be
still a part of the grant, so we're looking at that
long distance evaluation and how we can all work on it
together.

There is a development of training materials
and we've gotten the contents together and now we need
to come up with some sample training materials. And we
have the conference coming up. And we have after the
conference.

There is a key piece of Web Junction which is
developing that community. There's the forms. If
you're interested in how the forms work, there's a

Spanish-language outreach program which is part of Web
Junction. They use the forms a lot. Though I love --
you know, when you're thinking of acronyms, you really
need to SLOP. We went with GI-21 thank goodness. But
you can look at that page and kind of see where we're
wanting to go with the forms, developing trainer forms
so that the trainers have a place to kind of talk about
what worked and what didn't, but also forms for the
people that attend the training sessions for those non-
depository libraries. So there's a place, yes, they'll
know the trainer; yes, hopefully, through the trainer
they're going to learn about the depository libraries,
but a place for them to come and talk to other people
that were in their training session to talk to other
people that have been trained in their state, various
ways of working together in that community.

We do have to develop an extra amount of
modules. There's also the promotion piece of getting
the word out to the states that this is available. You
want a training session? Guess what, we have to do
training session. Let us come and do one.

And then implementation of the state training
plans and beginning the training. Taking the
development, the evaluation development and actually
evaluating the program. And I think a key piece is to

continue adding content to Web Junction so that it
continues to grow and as we have that practical work
out in the field of training that Web Junction
continues to grow and be useful as the project
continues.

And that's all I have. So any questions?

DENISE DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA.

As much as we would love to believe that
libraries, especially libraries in the US had internet
access speeds in excess of T-1 lines, they do not. And
in fact we have a number of libraries, especially west
of the Mississippi, specifically in some of the states
that are in plan who still have dial up. How
accessible are these pages to them?

KIRSTEN CLARK: For the most part, the pages
are -- there aren't that many images for one thing. So
that the loading of images is not as big a problem as I
think many pages are going to be. The files, we're
trying to keep them pretty simple again keeping away
from images. There are some, and you'll look at them.
We have some screen shots. And that's actually
something I've thought about is those that have are --
there's a couple that are quite laden down with screen
shots, which is great, but we need to make a version
that is smaller. However, there are certain things we

cannot because of the way Web Junction -- you know,

they're doing that, but they are aware of it. They

have -- they have rural libraries program, the Spanish-

language outreach. They're working with a lot of these

libraries. I just -- I know New Mexico. I lived in

New Mexico for two and a half years. I know those

libraries that are dealing with that, so we're trying

to address it as much as possible.

And I think when we get out and do the

training, that's where a lot of that is going to come

and it's like this is just not working. What can you

do differently. And at that point, we can re-evaluate

how we're doing things.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Jeff Swindells,

University of Missouri.

I'm wondering if you've thought at all about

the scalability of this, because I like it a lot. I

mean I think it's a great model, and, you know, we're

looking at doing something similar in Missouri, but why

recreate the wheel, so I was wondering if either in the

grant itself or sort of in thinking about the next

round, whether you've thought about what some of the

issues are in making this a national level effort?

TIM BYRNE: It really has been our plan to

try to take it to a next round, and we have had some

preliminary discussions about that. About what scale
we take it to, I'm not certain at this point and that
may depend on what our grant options are, but I think
trying to possibly work with another group of
regionals, you know, geographically situated is what
we're sort of leaning towards, but we're not committed
to anything at this point. We will be sitting down
with our grant writer and, you know, really discussing
what our options are, whether we're going to go back to
INLS to try continue this, whether we're going to look
at other sources for funding, but we will be trying to
take it to the next step.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Just one follow-up
question on that and that's about Web Junction. As you
move forward and if you decide that you want to change
platforms, is it pretty easy to get this stuff out and
re-purpose it?

KIRSTEN CLARK: No.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I mean it sounds like
it's kind of hard to get it in.

KIRSTEN CLARK: Oh, yes. It's been a very
interesting learning process. Yeah, it's -- the one
thing I think we have going for us is Web Junction is
really trying to make this workable for future. I
cannot say enough on how much they are -- we've never

dealt with this, but we're going to figure out how we can. And in fact of the technical difficulties we were having last week, was call them and get it fixed so that they knew we were doing this presentation. "We're going to help you all we can."

And a piece of it is if -- and I want to add to what Tim said what the grant is that New Mexico State Library, the potential if the grant doesn't go forward that it would housed with them since they have a contract, and I hope that's so. [indecipherable]

And so even though the grant may not -- you know, heaven forbid, I'm going with the fact that yes, we will be going forward some form. The content isn't going to disappear, and Web Junction really is pushing that this be a long-term commitment. So, but yeah, if worse case scenario, yeah, we're going to have some fun getting it out of there.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Richard Akeroyd, New Mexico State Library.

I just wanted to add to that that in some of the early planning discussions, we focused on Web Junction because of the kind of development that we know for us that Web Junction is doing, and it really is growing into a major resource. And once all of these difficulties, if you will, of getting stuff in

and getting these modules created is completed, it's going to be that much more accessible to other regionals in other parts of the country and indeed other parts of the world. So I think the up-front investment in getting it into Web Junction and making it -- having them help us make it work is really going to pay off for everybody over the long term.

TIM BYRNE: I think we really looked at, you know, there was a tremendous amount of potential with Web Junction and we really felt that our contribution would help make it a major resource. So they're very excited about us; we're very glad about them.

KIRSTEN CLARK: Any other questions?

BARBIE SELBY: Barbie Shelby, University of Virginia. I think this is terrific, and I'm real interested in, you know, being a partner or something at some point.

Because I had a couple of questions on the Web Junction front, you've got the module coordinators who have access to it and can presumably upload files or add those training resources or something, but like who has to pay to -- I mean, you know, ya'll are paying for everybody to have access? Would then other people, you know, where does the money come in as far as paying for Web Junction?

KIRSTEN CLARK: It's coming from the grant.

BARBIE SELBY: Right, right.

KIRSTEN CLARK: For the two years, but I think with Web Junction, we're putting it up. In essence, we're paying to put it up, but it's available to anybody. And we're setting it up, so any file that we're adding is going to show up on any of the partner pages. So ours is showing up on New Mexico and so forth.

In terms of your initial comment of whose adding the material, it technically is me and Jennie, because the way Web Junction is currently set up is when we go into add a file, we have access to the entire Web Junction site. Technically, I could take down the entire site if I really wanted to. We're not opening it up to everybody else at this point.

If it's -- what we talked with them about is if we can limit to our material, so I would be perfectly fine with having the module team leaders adding the content. I think would diverse -- make is easier for us to add content and to update content, but at this time, I do not feel comfortable and I would be wondering about Web Junction [indecipherable]. We never actually talked up front about having 10 different people have access to their entire website.

So that's something that we're working, but right now
it's just the two of us.

BARBIE SELBY: And my other question was
since GPO has license to Opal software, are there
possibilities for doing, you know, the train the
trainer distantly with Opal accessing Web Junction
pages?

KIRSTEN CLARK: I don't know that piece but
Web Junction has an Opal equivalent in Live Meeting
which they just have opened up. In fact I'm kind of
talking with them to see if we can't get that included
in. It's technically not part of our contract right
now. But I think they would be probably willing for us
to use it as in essence a demo of what the system can
do. And I've used both of them for the training, and
they're pretty similar, but I'm not sure about that.

TED PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.

I think the thing I would propose is that
that system would enable you to create an archive and
that could be presented to GPO and we could put that
into Opal and make that available as well.

RICHARD AKEROYD: This is Richard Akeroyd fro
the New Mexico State Library again.

Back to Barbie's first question. New Mexico
is one of I think now about a dozen states that are

what are called community partners within Web Junction.
And the way that works is that as a community partner
we subscribe to Web Junction on behalf of all the
libraries in the State of New Mexico.

We also add content. We have the basic
structure of the Web Junction page is that there are
six tabs, and we have what we call tab editors who are
from the library community around the state who have
been trained and regularly add content to those six
tabs on what we call Web Junction New Mexico. There's
Web Junction Connecticut, Web Junction Colorado, Web
Junction Arizona and so forth. So that's the -- those
people are adding content, and it's not quite as
complicated for them as this is, because this project
is new and it's expanded a lot on the basic structure
of Web Junction, as Kirsten said, but I think over time
as this develops, that kind of access to Web Junction
or at least that portion of it for which you have
access and which you're updating will be lot simpler
than Kirsten's presentation made it sound.

And again, this is a pilot. It's
experimental and it's developmental.

KIRSTEN CLARK: And again, it's new to them.
And so as we're coming up with questions and so they're
taking it back and looking at how -- what they need to

change and reconfigure so that we can make this useable
for the next group that might want to do a project like
this.

DENISE DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA.

Point of clarification, and I'll try to be
polite. This is federal grant. Are the modules
available to non-Web Junction partner states?

KIRSTEN CLARK: Yes. It's very available out
there. You threw me with the non-partner thing. I had
to think for a moment.

This is available to anybody that comes Web
Junction. You don't need to sign in. You just click
over on Web Junction, go to the government information
page and it's available.

With the partner libraries, my point in that
is that we're not -- there is a place within it that we
could limit it just to fine -- I could technically say
"no, nobody can get to this without our permission,"
but we -- we're not doing that. We're allowing to be
open to anybody. So it's -- when I say the partner
libraries, it's showing up on the New Mexico site. So
if somebody who is a member of New Mexico and part of
their partnership goes to look at the site, they're
going to look at the same thing that just, you know,
Joe Smith coming from Poughkeepsie is going to see when

they look at it.

So it's basically -- you think of a
university web page, anybody can come use the site,
search [inaudible] -- well, I guess that's probably not
the best example, but it's available out there.

DENISE DAVIS: Okay, second question. Again,
it's because it's federal money, it has to be available
to all. That's just a fact.

So at the end of this grant period,
presumably whatever modules are created by the end of
this grant period, Web Junction will continue to
provide free and open access in perpetuity?

KIRSTEN CLARK: That goes into the question
of there still is a fee associated with the Web
Junction. The grant is paying for that fee right now.
Whether it migrates to New Mexico and be free and part
of their site or we find another grant, there is that
piece. It's --

DENISE DAVIS: [indecipherable] save you the
money based on that criteria because I've been on
review panels. We rejected [inaudible] because it was
[inaudible] got it through.

KIRSTEN CLARK: Yeah.

DENISE DAVIS: No, seriously.

KIRSTEN CLARK: Well part of the grant we did

put in there that when the grant runs out, that we
already have a partner in place that is willing to take
that on.

RICHARD AKEROYD: I think -- this is Richard
Akeroyd again.

The basic part of Web Junction is anything
that's on there now is going to stay there, and it will
be freely accessible. The ongoing fee will have to do
with continuing to update it and add more. And that's
what New Mexico as one of the partners has committed to
do is to maintain that if we can't some kind of grant
money, but we'll do it through our state partnership.
And hopefully there are options to talk to the other
five-state partners and talk about perhaps sharing in
that, but we made a commitment to not let it die at the
end of the project, because we felt it was important
enough to do that, so.

KIRSTEN CLARK: Thank you.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Thank you very much, Tim
and Kirsten. That was very interesting.

Just a couple of reminders before we break
for lunch. Again, state library agency discussion
forum tonight at 5:00 p.m. in the Aspen Room.

There is a sign up out in the front there for
a tour of the U.S. Court of Appeals Tenth Circuit

Library. Make sure you -- there's a lot of detail on the sign up, but make sure no electronic devices. Make sure you have a photo ID and again there's additional information out there on that.

Also a little bit of a schedule addition change, whatever you would like. During the open forum today, we -- council is going to want to take some or part of the second half of that. We will be presenting some recommendations to GPO, and - but we are going to start at least the first half is going to be for those questions that you could not ask so far, and then if the questions die down. If they don't, we will need the last 30 to 45 minutes to do the recommendations that we've been working on.

Okay. Other than that, see you back at 1:30. Have a pleasant lunch.

(Off the record from 11:52 a.m. to 1:33 p.m.)

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: A piece of business, if Catherine Sayer is here or whoever's here from the U.S. Court of Appeals, if you would go when you have a chance, go outside and talk to Nick Ellis about the sign up that you put up about the tour. He just asked me; he had some questions about the tour and all that. So, again, if you are associated with the U.S. Court of Appeals Tenth Circuit and about the tour that you want

to do on Wednesday, Nick Ellis needs to talk to you, and Nick's out at the registration desk.

Okay. All right. This afternoon session is on web harvesting.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Hi, Bill.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Hey.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: What?

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: I don't want to upset our hard working secretary.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I'm not upset. I had to wait.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: And to start it off, start us off on the presentation is Kathy Brazee, and you're channeling Robin; right? Okay. So, thank you.

KATHY BRAZEE: Good afternoon. Thanks, Bill.

Cindy Etkin and I are tag teaming on this on behalf of Robin Haun-Mohamed who is unable to join us. Again, I'm Kathy Brazee. I'm with the Office of Education and Outreach in library services and content management.

We're going to follow the briefing paper fairly closely in the presentation, and then we have ample time for questions and comments after the overview. We're going to provide a brief overview, go through the assumptions in the briefing paper, and then

go through the questions we have in that paper.

Up here, we also have Matt Landgraf from the program management office of the office of the chief technical officer at GPO. And I just wanted to mention that Laurie Hall is here as well. She's down in the front row here on your right side for those of you in the audience, and she can address specific cataloging questions.

Katrina Stierholz will -- from Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, up here in council, will read the questions and facilitate that for us.

Just to give you some context, I'd like to ask you a few questions to start off. We had a session on web harvesting last fall at the federal depository library conference, and a white paper about our pilot project came out shortly after that. How many either attended that session and/or read the white paper? So it looks like at least 30 to 40 people in the audience or a good majority are familiar with web harvesting.

That session focused more on the technology related to web harvesting. This does show and focuses more on management, the harvested files and the ongoing harvesting activities.

So to give you an introduction, as you, of course, know, we're developing a digital repository,

and one of the ways we acquire current publications is through harvesting or capture of the publications.

And for background, we had a -- conducted a pilot project last year. It was a six-month pilot project with two vendors who ran the pilot simultaneously but separately, and they crawled the EPA website -- well they crawled for official EPA web publication, the EPA online publications, starting with the EPA website, and they did three crawls and then they compared the results with their crawl with the records in the catalog and U.S. government publications.

And the goal of the pilot was to test and develop automated and accurate tools and technologies to discover or identify the publications to assess them for scope determination whether or not they fall within the FDLP and the cataloging and/or the cataloging and indexing program and then to harvest them, and, of course, the leverage, the knowledge from the pilot to help build the requirements for the comprehensive harvesting solution to be implemented with the future digital system.

But, of course, we still have ongoing harvesting activities. We are conducting manual and semi-manual harvesting efforts. We used to call these

I believe just manual harvesting. I keep getting
corrected by James Mauldin in the office of archival
management that there's a difference. Manual is
basically bringing up a website and pointing and
clicking or saving as. And using semi-manual
harvesting is using the software tool, something like
Teleport Ultra to schedule content capture and re-
harvest content at known websites.

So library services and content management is
now in the process of developing an overall plan to
manage the acquisition classification, cataloging and
storage of all web harvested content, including the
publications captured through the EPA pilot. And
that's the focus of today's presentation. Of course,
there will be questions about the review of the
technologies and all that please feel free to ask after
the presentation.

And we still have these ongoing presentations
and we're planning for and also preparing for the
future digital system at the same time.

And I wanted to mention that applied in all
of the processes here on the slide of acquisition,
classification, cataloging and storage are all of the
activities within library services and content
management related to them. So, related to acquisition

is also reviewing the publications to determine whether or not they're in scope of GPO's information dissemination programs. So just because we're harvesting something doesn't mean that we don't do all of the other things that go along with it.

So these are the major issues as we see them right now. Assignment of Pearls or a successor system, we're looking at handles, review of policies related to harvesting, and, of course, cataloging all of the results in some way and then having some issues with harvesting complete publications using automated tools. So specifically to Pearls now, handles in the future, as you know, GPO currently assigns to Pearls to live content on the publication agency's website, and we only redirect the Pearls when the agency takes down the publication at their site. And the agencies have also indicated that it was preferable for us to direct users of the catalog to their site to increase visibility of their site and also enable browsing at their site. However, as you well know, the policy results in a considerable amount of work at GPO in terms of Pearl maintenance, and thanks to you notifying us about all of the broken Pearls, it helps us speed that review up.

Cindy is going to address many of these issues in a moment, but we have, of course, with all of

our projects going on, a need to review overall

policies related to the activities. And Cindy is going

to specifically address superintendent documents 304,

which is one of the policies, just the policy relating

to harvesting, specifically harvesting federal digital

publications for GPO's information dissemination

programs. And Cindy will probably touch on the other

issues as well momentarily.

So there are, of course, issues related to

cataloging. As you heard if you were in the

presentation yesterday for the future digital system,

there were a boatload of results from the automated

harvesting pilot project, and there's just so many

publications out there on agency websites. The volume

of -- potential volume of cataloging all these things

is an issue. So cooperative cataloging is something

GPO is looking at and exploring possible partnerships

as an additional way to provide bibliographic records

for this content.

And, of course, we've developed procedures

and insure that there are quality control mechanisms in

place to make sure that the records are viable, and, of

course, must complete the testament that's either the

nine dot 50 gateway as well.

I wanted to add here that, of course, as

we're pursing cooperative cataloging, this will take some time. We just finished a pilot project at the EPA website. So as we heard this morning in the terms of the training initiatives, it takes a little bit more time when working with the pilot project and without a doubt something on the EPA website has already changed since we crawled it on the EPA website. So while we're looking at cataloging, the results from the EPA pilot, we are, of course, continuing to look at the EPA website, harvest as needed and catalog as needed, and that's within the regular workflow, which, of course, is huge as you know.

So the other issue we have related specifically to the pilot project is fairly complicated. We have the results from the two vendors, and it was interesting to see the results come back, because there were several results where we did not see a complete publication but something like a chapter of a publication or an appendix as a separate file. And when we talk about the files coming back from the vendors, we actually use the word "document" in the white paper about the pilot, because we haven't reviewed that file yet to determine whether or not it is the publication and a publication within scope. Certainly the point of the pilot and the point of using

the automated technologies was to have those

technologies help us with scope determination of the

pilot and it's the first time we want to review the

results to make sure that they are in fact a correct

determination within scope.

So we've got all of these separate files out

there. We don't really know how many publications we

have yet to catalog. We're backing up all the data

making it available to staff members. So, it's

estimated that at least 25 percent of it within scope

content represents only a portion of the complete

publications.

Last but not least for my part of the

presentation, to help address all these issues, we, of

course, have ongoing technology discovery.   And Matt

Landgraf certainly is heavily involved in all this,

continuing to work to develop more fully automated

publication harvesting tools and methodologies in

preparation for full implementation in the future

digital system, and includes issues -- review of all

this includes issues related to [indecipherable] of the

portions of publications and to their entirety.

Inspection of the harvested content -- again not

necessarily publications until we review them, but the

files that come back, review of the content for

accuracy of scope determination, and then we need to
catalog and classify all the material and for the in-
scope contents catalog and classify all of the
material.

So I'm going to hand it over to Cindy who's
now going to talk a little bit more about policies
specifically.

CINDY ETKIN: We do already have in place SOD-
304 which was previously ID-74, but this has been in
place a couple of years or so. And the policy is
harvesting federal digital publications for GPO's
information dissemination programs. And the policy
statement you can see up on the board that we will
acquire publications for inclusion in the national
bibliography in the FDLP through manual and automated
harvesting. And we'll use automated harvesting
programs only the publishing agencies' advice and prior
consent, and permission to manually harvest
publications from agency publicly accessible websites
will not be sought.   We do have the URL there for
you to get to the -- directly to the policy statement.

As Kathy mentioned, we're going to be
reviewing a lot of policies, including this one. This
policy provides the internal guidance that we need and
instructions for harvesting from the website to the

agencies, and we just can guarantee that they're going

to be changes to this as we have learned from the

harvesting pilot project. We have a lot of questions

that we need to answer as a result of what we've

learned and what we've seen from the harvesting pilot.

And I have a little packet here that I don't

think anybody has seen this yet, not even Ric, but

these are the questions in all the areas in which

people have been forwarding which they think that need

to be policy issues addressed, policy issues that need

to be answered. This is five pages long, so we will be

going through this, and I can guarantee you that this

policy is going to be revised, and that there probable

will be others put in place. And some of them are

actually turning out to be procedures, but we're going

to do standard operating procedures as well.

And we've been brainstorming. This is the

result of the brainstorming. We're going to look very

closely at scope.

This is the policy that I started drafting a

while back and it sort of got put on the back burner

from other things. It's coming off the back burner as

soon as I get back to Washington next week, and we'll

be looking at that.

We'll be looking at cataloging and indexing

and we're going to be looking at online access. And how we're going to do this, we're going to be looking at cataloging priorities, collection development -- you all have collection development policies; right? We're working on one, and it could be that the scope will actually roll into that and some of these other individual policies that we'll look at in the meantime may ultimately roll into a larger collection policy too.

But lots of things to look at, lots of questions to answer, and we hope to do that.

Before I turn it over to Katrina, I'm going run through the assumptions that we've made. GPO will continue to develop more fully automated publication harvesting tools and methodologies as part of the future digital system.

GPO will continue to manually and semi-manually harvest known publications. GPO will make harvesting decisions in accordance with library services and content management collection development policy when it's written. It will get written.

WALTER WARNICK: You want the questions about the assumptions now or later?

CINDY ETKIN: You want me to go back?

WALTER WARNICK: Yeah, okay, yes, please.

This is Walt Warnick from the Department of Energy.

The concept of developing more fully automated publishing and harvesting tools and methodologies is certainly great, but it's making us part of the future digital system. We had a discussion about this in council last evening, and so I'll reveal the consensus of the discussion, although I'm not the chair of the council, I'll reveal confidences I suppose.

The sense of the council is that harvesting is a very powerful technique for finding fugitive documents, and that finding fugitive documents is something that GPO desperately needs to do. And the beauty of it is it makes the content that you find searchable, and that in itself is a major step forward. Now the down side of harvesting is that the information you found does not usually, in fact practically never, comes with a full catalog record. And so if you want to make a catalog record of each item that you find, you have an enormous burden on your cataloging department. In fact we heard from Laurie yesterday -- if I heard her correctly, she has cataloged about 8,000 items since October.

And these experiments that you ran with EPA, one of them found 80 something thousand items, and the

other one found 200 and some odd thousand items, and that's a far, far cry from 8,000 items.

So if you hold up bringing in EPA items until they're cataloged, you might as well not have harvested in the first place, because you're never going to do it unless you can gear up your cataloging to it or magnitude level of productivity beyond what it is now. Of course, cataloging is very labor intensive, and there are opportunities on the horizon for decreasing the amount of labor that's necessary for cataloging. I would call that vision into the future.

But I think the sense of council if I heard it correctly, was that we ought not be waiting for things like that. If GPO has an opportunity to make government information searchable, they ought to just do it and let the cataloging catch up, let the automated cataloging technology catch up, let FDsys catch up, and get on with it. That deals with the first general assumption.

CINDY ETKIN: Any comments on the second assumption? I didn't mean that to be funny. Third assumption?

WALTER WARNICK: You are going to harvest in co-ordinance with OSCM collection development policy. I think your policy ought to be geared to support

making information available to the American people,

not the other way around.

If the policy is inconsistent with what

harvesting decisions that make sense for the people,

it's the policy that ought to be changed, not the

harvesting process.

CINDY ETKIN: Do you all want to talk about

the third one more while I write it down?

My [indecipherable] with the content

management will continue to be responsible for scope

determination of harvested content and for

classification and cataloging publications deemed to be

in scope for GPO's information dissemination programs

even after implementation of the future digital

systems.

WALTER WARNICK: This is Walt Warnick again

on a roll.

You mentioned earlier that you are going to

harvest only with agencies giving permission to

harvest.

Now, let's review how we got here. If you

need to harvest an agency, it is for one and only one

reason, and that is that agency has not complied with

Title 44. Agency compliance with Title 44, you already

have their content. You don't need the harvest. So

why would you ask permission from somebody who's
already not obeying the law? You want to harvest.

Any agency who has not provided you the
federal content, you ought to go harvest them and
challenge them to challenge you, because they dare not
raise a peep, because they're not in compliance with
the law already, and I guarantee they won't say a thing
about it.

Now the reason agencies don't comply with
Title 44 is not because they're filled with a bunch of
evil people. The reason why they don't comply with
Title 44 is because Title 44 places a burden on the
agency for compliance. And a lot of times they don't
see in their interest to devote to resources to comply.
And that's the -- so if they don't have the resources
to comply with Title 44, they're not going to have the
resource to object when you harvest them.

ANN MILLER: Cindy, this is Ann Miller
interrupting the Walt Warnick show.

I agree with you in part, Walt, but I do also
see that we have agencies who partially comply, and who
for whatever reason comply in some areas, but don't
comply in others that you know. The most famous
example is the Environmental Protection Agency, which
is, you know, large, has a lot of regional offices that

where we lose materials.

So I think we need to be careful to say, well, you know, the Census Bureau has played really well with the federal depository library program over the years, but it doesn't mean that we don't have fugitive documents from the Census Bureau in that it wouldn't be worthwhile harvesting some of their web pages.

On another note, on the assumption that LSCM will continue to be responsible for the scope of determination, I'm not sure that you can make that assumption because you can't assume that the organization of GPO was going to be exactly the same now then as it is now. It could be some other function, some other part.

You all could be reorganized again or, you know, once FDsys comes online. So I think -- I'm not sure we can actually -- I can actually agree with this particular assumption, because I don't think you can make it. I'm not saying it's a bad one. I just don't think you can make that assumption.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill of Hemphill and Associates.

A couple of interesting things in private industry is we tend to beg forgiveness and not ask

permission. Going after this content on websites a lot
of times is done by private industry. And many times
the corporation or whoever has their data incorporated
with our websites is grateful that it's done, because
they have another outlet for that information.

So, as Walt said, you know, go after the
data. They're not complying with the law. I think
they'll be grateful that they have another outlet for
the information.

I have one other comment, but it escaped me
at the moment, so.

CINDY ETKIN: And I also told you I could
guarantee that SOD-304 would be revised.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth,
University of South Carolina.

I also find the last phrase fairly
interesting in that -- well I could say a couple of
things, but I will try to say this nicely -- it seems
to me that there is a fear in that phrase as to who
will be setting the policies and in charge of how the
harvesting is done. And I think that -- so what I read
into that is there needs to be more discussion about
that particular as FDsys becomes a real system. And
who is going to manage the content harvesting in this?
Is it going to be an IT function or is it going to be

cooperative effort between IT folks and content

managers? So, I guess I'm asking more of question back

and what's the future of how as a system is developed

and becomes functioning, who is going to be responsible

for the content?

      PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill again.

      Along those same lines, I remembered my

earlier questions. Is this going to be demand driven?

In other words, is there going to be mechanism for

libraries to go in and say, "I want this information."

Or is it just something that's going to be determined

by LSCM?

      CINDY ETKIN: Back to me. Where's Robin?

      PETER HEMPHILL: The point being is if it's

demand driven by your customers, if you will, you're

going to spend more time gathering the information that

they want versus gathering information that they don't

need.

      RIC DAVIS: This is Ric Davis from GPO.

      I'm not quite sure I know the answer to

Pete's question right now, but going to Bill's question

if I could for a second, I think we envision that FDsys

is going to enable the technology and the

infrastructure for us, but the library unit as the

business unit will continue to make those decisions

about the content.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Well, and not to upset any
IT folks, because IT folks are very important, but when
it comes to content and content management, I would
rather the content experts be the individuals
associated with it, or at minimum working as a team
effort.

CINDY ETKIN: I'm going to attempt to answer
Pete's question.

Among the five pages here, one of the items
here is whether we should determine harvesting
priorities, and that gets to being demand driven. We
would seek input from the community to do that, but we
also have a mandate from Title 44 that we do have to be
comprehensive.

PETER HEMPHILL: Thank you.

CINDY ETKIN: So it's both. Okay.

AMY WEST: Amy West, University of Minnesota.

I just wanted to mention that if the FDsys
works out to be able to accept content from external
partners, say different depository libraries, it's
possible that some institutions could have contracts
with Archive It, and they could be archiving material.
And is it how much time do you want to spend worrying
about the scope of the material that might be input

into the FDsys from somebody externally or not. It
seems like in some ways it might be better to take as
much as can come in, but this is all hypothetical on
those other elements.

CINDY ETKIN: Thanks. Okay, where were we?
The second one? Okay.

Walt?

WALTER WARNICK: This is Walt, yeah, Walt
Warnick, Department of Energy.

This scope issue is what's really the
Achilles' heel of the two prototypes that were done
with EPA material and that all kinds of material got
into the harvest that was clearly out of scope. The
technological fix to that, if you will, is really a
human fix as well, is that you would have people who
were guiding the harvesting with your crawler in
advance, so you'd give the crawler some clues where to
go to ahead of time so it doesn't trip over other
material that is inappropriate.

The concept in the prototypes was that they
would weed out the out of scope material after the
fact, but they would that automatically. And a
difficulty with that is computers have a doggone hard
time making judgmental decisions. They can tell
whether or not one number's than another and the order

of things, but making judgmental decisions is very,

very hard for computers. People are great at making

judgmental decisions. And so the idea of GPO trusting

somebody in the FDLP community to make a decision about

scope, I think that is a very, very preferable choice

as opposed -- as trusting some mindless computer, if

you will, to make that decision for you.

I think that if you can enlist the FDLP to

help you make decisions about what's in scope and not

without a scope, I think that that is a very, very safe

and productive way for GPO to proceed.

CINDY ETKIN: Matt?

MATT LANDGRAF: This is Matt Landgraf with

the Government Printing Office.

I thank you, Walt, for your comments. And I

think we actually sort of came to a similar conclusion

at the end of our pilot, and one of the recommendations

that we made in the white paper was to basically do

more studying of [indecipherable] websites before we go

in and actually harvest. And that would mean both, you

know, an expert within GPO or the library community

looking at the site before we harvest it, you know, to

find, you know, where the in-scope content is, but

also, you know, some planned work with actually with

the federal agency, and with the federal agency web

master so that they can give us a little bit of

indication as to where some of the in-scope content

would be. So, actually I look forward to more

conversations about that, because we're, as you know,

we're in the sort of the discovery phase as far as

technology goes and I think the more ideas we can bring

to the table, the better.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing

Office.

I agree with Walt's point as well. One thing

I do want to mention going back to the earlier

conversation about cataloging, Laurie talked quite a

bit yesterday about the detect contract and how we're

looking at automated tools for the creation of the

cataloging records, and I think that is a very big lump

in the snake right now, and as Laurie will you, we have

20 people maybe in our cataloging operation, so

particularly as we go forward beyond this pilot and we

look at the other material that will come into the

program from the harvesting technologies, we have to

have automated ways as well to help us with that

cataloging piece.

WALTER WARNICK: Just to be clear, I'm very,

very hopeful that that project that my colleagues in

the Department of Defense are running, but it's not

there yet. And I think the, you know, the prospects
for success for us to harvest a lot less than 100
percent. So I think maybe a little contingency plan in
case that project doesn't quite deliver.

I think in any case it's not going to deliver
100 percent catalog. It's going to be a partial
solution at best, and I think the question is how much
of a partial solution is it going to deliver?

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO.

I agree. I think it's very much like we were
talking about with the automated technology tools for
harvesting. They're still the human element that needs
to come into play on both of those.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

With regard to the cataloging and actually
demand-driven content, I kind of view GPO as not the
people doing the work, but the people that would
provide the tools to do the work as far as the
cataloging part. Perhaps their people are editors and
coordinators with the sum of all knowledge in the
community. So the information being fed in, such as
URL's or content, it's in demand. Maybe you have a
registry for FLDP people put in the different URL's
that need to be scanned and crawled, as well as from
the cataloging standpoint, maybe you provide tools to

allow people to submit cataloging information and then have the people in GPO review it, not create it. Because you'll have I believe a much bigger rate to be able to have much more volume of content than if GPO tries to take it on by their own.

LAURIE HALL: I guess I'll have to chime in here. Laurie Hall, GPO.

You talk about cooperative cataloging. There's some of the options that we're looking, we also have to remember when we say cataloging, everybody thinks school-level cataloging. So we're looking at options on particularly this EPA harvesting stuff just maybe a brief cataloging record. I talked about that yesterday. We doing a test pilot. So it's not, you know, the full level cataloging. We may be doing some of that material as, you know, full level, but we're also looking at doing some of the material as the brief bib records. So there's going to be more on that.

But Mark Sandler and I have talked about a wide variety of cooperative cataloging scenarios, people helping us, we looking at stuff, we sending stuff out to people. So we are in those discussions at this point.

CINDY ETKIN: Okay, moving on. Material harvested buy not within scope of the Federal

Depository Library Program or the cataloging and

indexing program will not be retained by GPO.

WALTER WARNICK: Walt Warnick.

Agreed.

CINDY ETKIN: Done. Library services and

contact management may use a combination of in-house

cataloging, cataloging contracts and automated metadata

extraction to create bibliographic records for web

harvest to publications.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: This may I think goes

back to Walt's issue. For me, one of the problems I

had with this document was that it put together two

unlike things, and that's web harvesting and

cataloging. And I think for conceptual clarity, we

need to look at web harvesting and making that material

searchable and available. And then we have the

cataloging part of it which should happen according to

cataloging priority.

And one of the problems is we're trying to

talk about them at the same time. And I think they're

very different things. So we start to get caught in

the trap of well, you know, there's this harvesting

stuff and before we can let anyone see it, you know, we

got to catalog it et cetera, et cetera, but they are

very different.

MATT LANDGRAF: This is Matt Landgraf from GPO. Yeah, Jeff, I actually do completely agree with you. And that issue has actually come to light a little bit more since the white paper was released. We tried to get at that -- that sort of thing in the white paper that there's this, you know, universe of additional processing that needs to happen to content before it can be, you know, made available through the FDLP, including cataloging, but a few other things as well.

And, you know, I agree as well that, you know, we'd probably be using completely methodologies and completely different tools to do that. So that comment is well accepted and well heard.

CINDY ETKIN: Okay, Jeff, the next assumption that bibliographic records for web harvested publications will be completed in accordance with overall cataloging priority.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: My comment exactly.

WALTER WARNICK: And the -- this is Walt Warnick again.

And the threshold decision that GPO has to make is information that's harvested, but yet you don't have the resources or the time to catalog it, what do you do? And I think the sense of the council is you go

ahead and make that available to the American people.

Make it searchable for the American people, and let the

cataloging catch up later. I'm not at all clear that

is the decision that GPO has reached.

CINDY ETKIN: It's a decision that we reached

a while ago with other information, not necessarily

harvested, that how we're going to use our federated

search product meta-lib to get into agency databases

for which we haven't cataloged. So that's on the

table.

Bibliographic records for web harvested

publications will be created in an abridged or brief

level. The depository library community will be given

the opportunity to review new standards prior to

implementation.

As cataloging practices change over time, the

GPO cataloging standards for web harvested publications

may change as well.

Moving on. Library services and content

management will explore the use of automated metadata

extraction tools as a method to create bibliographic

records for web harvested publications.

Katrina.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: All right, well based on

the discussion we've had so far, I have some high

expectations for this.

What I'm going to do is read the questions for discussion, the usual thing, and council for comments and then open it up to the whole group.

Okay. So the first is are the assumptions stated above correct with respect to processing web harvested publications?

Wow, Walt, come on.

WALTER WARNICK: This is Walt Warnick from the Department of Energy.

I think the answer to some of the assumptions were fine, but some of them aren't. I mean it's as simple as that.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: All right. Where's the list? Anybody else in the audience want to comment? You might have some general comments at this point of some of the assumptions that were put up there as well.

KATHY HARRELL: Kathy Harrell, State Library of Pennsylvania.

I do have a question for you. When you were doing your harvesting, did you come up against firewalls and different impediments? Were you getting the information and content and what did you do about that and how does that fit into the assumptions?

MATT LANDGRAF: The shortest -- this is Matt

Landgraf with GPO.

The short answer to that is, yes, there are --
-- there were impediments in the EPA website including
firewalls and robots.txt files. I believe the policy,
correct me if I'm wrong, Cindy, says that the GPO will
honor robots.txt files, but because of the relationship
that we have with EPA throughout the pilot, we were
able to get permission to actually crawl some of the
databases within EPA.gov and have robots.txt
exclusions, but only with their permission. So, you
know, I don't know if Cindy can talk more about policy
in honoring robots.txt, but, you know --

KATHY HARRELL: So do you see yourselves
having to do that with each agency that you go to is to
get specific permissions when you come up to an
impediment? That's going to take a lot of time is what
I'm saying.

MATT LANDGRAF: Once again, I don't want to
speak about policy, but I'm --

KATHY HARRELL: Sure.

MATT LANDGRAF: -- seeing Ted over there nod
his head "yes," so.

KATHY HARRELL: Okay. Thank you.

WALTER WARNICK: I can -- this is Walt
Warnick again.

I can answer the question of what we do in the Department of Energy and that is that we do not protect or prevent people from seeing anything that's released, that's publicly released. The only thing is we kind of prevent people from -- the public from seeing something is because there is a law or other good and substantial reason for not releasing it.

I think GPO's charter has to do with things that are published. And I think it's not really reasonable to say -- to call a document that's protected by the agency by a firewall or by some other mechanism to keep the public out. I don't think it's fair to call that document published.

So I think Matt's doing the right thing by honoring restrictions on access material, because he really has no mechanism or no means to figure out why something is protected, but I can assure you that at least in the case the Department of Energy, we only protect things for good and substantial reasons.

RIC DAVIS: If I could just add to that in relation to Kathy's comment. I think that's part of our challenge with the idea of having the technology, turning it on and trying to harvest all the material, because what we're finding as well is that intentionally or unintentionally, at times there's

material that's within scope of the FDLP, and it's
behind a robot exclusive rule. And I think it is part
of that time consuming process of relationship building
to make sure that we can get it all.

STEVE WEST: Steve West, Penn State.

One of the things that seems to be missing in
the assumptions is any sort of interaction with the
agencies in terms of this harvesting. I know that the
comment was made earlier about, you know, agencies
participating in where you should do harvesting, but it
seems to me that if as you work through this whole
harvesting process, there could be some ways to think
about how do we begin to standardize how these agencies
are publishing these things that will assist in future
harvesting. And for that matter even coming up with
some ways to assist in creating automatic cataloging,
record cataloging by some, you know, simply standards,
title, you know these sorts of things, in the metadata
that they're using to describe their publications.

And I think I didn't see anything in those
assumptions that talked about that type of interaction
with the agencies.

MATT LANDGRAF: Once again, I'll speak from
the perspective of the pilot and the white paper, but
we -- excuse me one second -- we did put into the white

paper that, you know, really more work needs to be done directly with the agency in order to, you know, find in-scope content and, you know, have them help us find in-scope content.

And while we didn't really mention the issue that you brought up of developing standards for posting content onto the web, you know, it seems like something -- it seems like it would be a good thing if we could possibly explore things like that in our cooperation with the agency.

GIL BALDWIN: Hi. This is Gil Baldwin from GPO.

A year ago Richard Huffine and I served on a committee called categorization of government information. It was working to develop recommendations for OMB in carrying out the e-government legislation. Part of that effort was to figure a very simply metadata scheme that agencies could apply, so much of what you're talking about. And we had a lot of internal debate in our committee about how simple to make this and so forth. And we really came down to a scheme that would have imposed a very minimal workload on the agencies, but I'm sorry to tell you that OMB did not accept that recommendation.

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi. This is Kathy Brazee from

GPO.

Great minds think alike. I was pretty much going to say the same thing Gil did. Both vendors from the automated publication harvesting pilot project suggested that we work again with agencies or continue to work with agencies to develop metadata schemes. Of course, EPA is just one agency and all the agencies are different and they're all going to have the public CD-URL's that we want to start with and in publication repositories that could use as a CD-URL where we certainly could get a high volume of high quality publications to start with.

So the point well taken, each agency is definitely different and their web pages are set up differently.

STEVE HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame.

I like the assumptions. The only issue that I have that I don't think we want to carry forward too much of the baggage of a paper environment.

Walt points to some of it in terms of we can harvest. It is a benefit to an agency that does not seem to be meeting its obligation for one reason or another that automation allows us to lessen that burden at the same time meeting a need that we have. With the collection of element policy in developing that, my

caution is Title 44 pretty much gives you a collection of element policy. You know if it doesn't have without educational, and I can't quote it anymore, I'm sorry.

The third is, you know, under the piece of baggage within libraries, we don't stop buying things waiting for cataloging to catch up. So I think while you're aware, you know, the process, harvesting should be going just as buying goes, whether the catalogers have a backlog or we have a brief record or we have a data set collection, as my library began to call it, a pile of stuff that we can index and get at until our standard library mechanisms allow us to catch up.

So my caution would be assumptions is, you know, don't carry too much baggage forward and really kind of put it as, yeah, we want to really harvest for the benefit of harvesting, and then weed off what we need to weed of that is totally outside of Title 44 as appropriate for the public to have access to.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Okay. We're going to go on to the next one.

Should web harvested publications be identified as such in the catalog of U.S. government publications?

Council?

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

I'm a big believer in making sure people know where the source of this -- of their information is coming from and how it got there.

ANN MILLER: Although -- this is Ann Miller.

I think cataloging -- I mean the source, when you say "source" would be the agency web page. It wouldn't necessarily be we harvested it. It's like saying we -- putting it in the catalog that -- my respect to Steve and his interest in not looking at the past and formats -- but it's looking like saying this book is printed on acid-free paper and sticking in the catalog. I'm not sure why we would say this was harvested from a web page. We could say this was published by the EPA and contacted on its web page, but how we got there doesn't matter. Does that make sense?

PETER HEMPHILL: It may matter from the standpoint of if you're only getting portions of the document.

ANN MILLER: The only thing important for the document [inaudible].

PETER HEMPHILL: Well, okay, but that conflicts with what we were saying earlier with get the information in there and then catalog it.

WALTER WARNICK: Well, the question presumes that the information is in the catalog in the first

place. So I think that Ann's point is well taken that
the agency publishes, then the publishes it and whether
GPO gets it via catalog or by a submission by the
agency to the GPO, I'm not sure why the information
customer cares whether that ought to be recorded
somewhere for some sort of providence concern or
something like that. I think it's pretty esoteric, but
I guess I wouldn't to address that, you know, that
esoteric concern.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This sounds like -- this is
Bill Sudduth.

This sounds like the electronic equivalent of
the black dot.

RICHARD AKEROYD: This is Richard Akeroyd,
New Mexico State Library.

It seems to me that the only reasonable
reason that we would want to designate it as harvested
is if for some reason or another in the harvesting
process, the content or the document was changed so
that then the customer would know that they don't have
the original document but some very variant upon it,
and if harvesting is a way to identify that for them.
Otherwise, I can't see any point in taking the time to
identify it that way.

DENISE DAVIS: This is Denise Davis with ALA.

Actually I think there's a huge reason that it's actually for the agency not for the public. And that is the agency knows how GPO got the document, whether they gave it to them or whether it was trolled. And I think that's the key there.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: And for my own -- I can see how just as a researcher now when they have URL's and they cite them, they cite that it was accessed on blankety-blank date from blankety-blank site. I think the same thing would be relevant in a catalog.

GIL BALDWIN: Hi. This is Gil Baldwin from GPO yet again.

And I'm not here to speak to what's in the catalog of government publications, but in FDsys we will be capturing the source of any content that we have in the system. That'll be included in the mods metadata record.

MATT LANDGRAF: Yeah, and that's a -- this is Matt Landgraf.

That's a requirements within the harvester as well to capture the date, time and location of the content that was harvested so that information can be maintained within the system.

CINDY ETKIN: Well that's just to fill in the blank in the catalog. That's already there. Just

populate that automatically.

MATT LANDGRAF: Okay.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin at GPO.

The current policy -- well it doesn't mention specifically the catalog of U.S. Government Publications. It says that among the data elements, metadata elements of harvested files would be language that indicates that this is an authorized captured and archived file of the original, but it doesn't say that that's what's in the catalog, so imposing the question of whether it needs to be in the catalog and record.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: If this would be easier for -- Jeff Swindells, University of Missouri.

It would be easier for me to understand if this is saying whether it should be a descriptive metadata or are we saying it should be in other types of metadata that we carry along with this.

And if this -- so are we saying it should be in the descriptive metadata? I mean I'm not -- I think it would be fine to say that.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible] you want, go ahead.

JERRY BREEZE: Jerry Breeze, Columbia University.

And this question seems to get at all of the

assumptions that there's a underlying assumption here
that somehow these web harvested publications are
intrinsically different from the publications that are
coming into GPO in some other fashion, and I don't
think that's necessarily true.

We're talking about different levels of
cataloging for the web harvested publications only. Or
are we going to apply those standards to all the
publications?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Should LSCM point Pearls
at the live copy of a publication on the agency website
or at the archived copy on a GPO server?

Council?

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

My past experience with doing this is mixed.
The problem -- I hate to confuse the issue, but there's
downsides to pointing in that you've got to make sure
you keep those updated and cross-referenced, and
that'll be a full time job.

And the downside to storing it all is you
need a disc farm. And so keeping track of all that
information either way, we opted to point to the areas.
Just because of the sheer volume, it was easier to
reconcile the links than it was to have to physically
move all the data around.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth.

Should this question be updated to say "Pearls/handles?"

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO.

I think it should. And going back to Pete's point, I think the challenge is right now under Pearls is that we're doing both. We've got the challenge of trying to point to the content while it's on the agency site, and we're also archiving a copy on our permanent server. And this to me is one of our most challenging questions as we go forward about whether or not we revisit this policy.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: I have to say both as a site where, you know, we want people to come to our site at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, so if GPO were to catalog it, we want people to come there because we think they're going to find other relevant information.

On the other hand, if we are to change our directories or something, then GPO has to do a lot of work. Boy, I could argue both sides of this one pretty well.

MARK SANDLER: And unless I'm not understanding this, -- this is Mark Sandler from CIC.

I really know no reason to believe that

agencies have the commitment to permanence that GPO has. So my sense is that really you have an obligation to take this content in and manage it in perpetuity to fulfill your mission. No?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: But that's not what this is asking.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well, that was my question. If this is asking about what is it pointing to in the record, it's going to be at GPO as well. I mean -- yeah, this is Jeff Swindells.

We have a, you know, our institutional repository -- in our institutional repository at the University of Missouri, most of our departments before they'll play -- and not many of them actually do play, but like other institutional repositories -- but they want to make sure that traffic gets sent to their department pages, because they think that's very valuable, so.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO.

And that's really been the overall driving issue for years, a perception by pointing to the permanent accessible copy at GPO first, that we may be taking away that traffic. And that may really be the sub-issue here that we need to figure out.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: So are you suggesting,

Ric, -- this is Katrina -- that if you pointed to live site, you wouldn't archive a copy on the GPO server?

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO.

No, not at all.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Good.

RIC DAVIS: What we're proposing here is whether or not from the beginning should the link go and point to the permanent archived copy at GPO instead of pointing to the link on the agency site.

WALTER WARNICK: Walt Warnick, Department of Energy.

We face different requirements than GPO, but as a matter of practice, we always point to the live page. We never point to something that we recorded, but then we're faced with different motives and different missions than is GPO, so consider that for what it's worth.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Anybody else?

PETER HEMPHILL: I guess the underlying question here is does that information need to be preserved, or is there a statutory requirement to preserve that information. And I see lots of pitfalls with preserving that information because you have various external links and other things that may be inaccurate once they're recorded.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: I can answer that.
Because your user will get access to that site. I mean
if they go to the live site instead of the GPO site,
then theoretically they're looking at the subject and
theoretically there will be more relevant information
there.

I mean that's certainly a good possibility.
So that's why you'd go to the live site rather than
GPO.

PETER HEMPHILL: Right, but if there's a
statutory requirement to maintain, the historical
perspective on things, if you have to maintain that
historical perspective in there, there may be imbedded
links within that information that may go to obsolete
information.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Yes, Amy.

AMY QUINN: Amy Quinn, Central New Mexico
Community College.

My personal perspective is that should point
about. It's very simple. Researchers, typically we go
to the live site, but if the live site's unavailable
for any reason, they'll go to the archive site. That's
what our users want. They just want the material.
They don't care where it's stored. They want the
material.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

I would -- that would be pretty tough,
because you need to make sure you get the most recent
version of it, and you have to make sure you're in
sync.

PAT RAGAINS: I'm Pat Ragains from the
University of Nevada, Reno.

And just thinking about his into how it would
implemented in the indefinite future, say 20 or more
years down the road, just very recently I'm sure we can
all remember when a number of existing federal agencies
were reorganized under the Department of Homeland
Security. Okay, so their web address is in many cases
change.

Perhaps with a view toward permanent
preservation, it might be best to point to GPO's
archived copy, but provide the user with the
information about where it was -- from where it was
obtained. Of course, you would do that always in the
record, but, you know, if you're thinking about a
permanent record, maintaining that original URL, it's
going to be quite difficult if not impossible.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski
[phonetic] from the California State Library.

I'm confused by this. Are we -- does this

question refer only to the catalog of government
publications as we know it today, or does this also
refer to the future digital system? Because it was my
understanding that any future digital system, we will
be able to access the live copy that's on the agency
website, and all previous versions of that document
going back to the very beginning. And to do that in
our current system, we need links that take us to those
documents, which is going to mean that we're going to
need a multiplicity of links in any kind of search
mechanism and retrieval mechanism.

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi. This is Kathy Brazee from
GPO.

I think the assumption with this question is
that it's just references to the catalog of U.S.
government publications where Pearls are currently
being used.

NANCY ANDERSON: Nancy Anderson, Library of
Michigan.

We have some experience with this with state
documents. And we found that we had to go both; that
our users did not accept exclusively the archived
version. We had to accept the fact that we had a link
checking problem, and we just had to live with that.
We didn't have any choice.

We started out thinking that it would be neater to go to the archive version, and it didn't work. So, I guess I'm kind of with several other people in that seeing the problem with a multiple set of links.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Okay. Are cooperative cataloging partnerships, an avenue LSCM should explore to assist with the creation of bibliographic records for web harvested publications?

WALTER WARNICK: This is Walt Warnick, Department of Energy.

It is the only way.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Okay. Are the cataloging levels outlined above acceptable?

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi, this is Kathy Brazee from GPO again.

I apologize to David and everyone else for the lack of clarity on this. This refers back to an assumption which we've already discussed.

The bibliographic records for web harvested publications will be created at an abridged or unabridged level.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: This is Jeff Swindells, University of Missouri.

My assumption, of course, is that these

records can be enhanced by partners should they choose, and so if the community decides that something needs more, then they can certainly get it more, and GPO does accept copy cataloging.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

Just to qualify a little bit on the previous questions, certified partners, make sure their authentic and that people know who cataloged it.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Are you ready for us now?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Yeah, go ahead.

SANDRA McANINCH: Sandra McAninch, University of Kentucky.

The other thing I would ask is that GPO vet the cataloging and make sure their symbol eventually appears on the record so that those of us who use vendors to get our records can get that cataloging.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Are there groups of publications that should be among those manually or semi-manually harvested by LSCM?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Like what?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: That's what I think when I read that.

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi, this is Kathy Brazee from GPO again.

I think one of the issues this question gets

to -- I didn't write these, so I'm making an assumption -- but one of the issues that this question relates to is frequency of harvested integrating resources and we obviously need to run the harvester on a schedule and review the agency websites before harvest. So if there are types of online publications such as integrating resources, are those types of things GPO should look at on a regular basis or make sure that we harvest in such a way that we guarantee we capture the entire publication?

And integrating resources may just be an example. There may be other things to consider.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Well, this is Katrina.

And I'll comment on that. Yeah, I think with input from the library community, I'm sure there will be things that appear or that you guys are not harvesting regularly enough that the library community will send you e-mails about. Hopefully, then you will respond with your good customer service and start harvesting them more frequently.

KATHY BRAZEE: Well a little comment on that, as we investigate and develop the technologies for automated harvesting, it's possible that there may be some things we wish to manually harvest in the near term, or use semi-manually harvesting tools in the near

term; so I don't know if there are any comments about that.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: So this -- with this you're referring to things before we start web harvesting for real that you're wondering does the library community have things that we would like you to start harvesting now; is that correct?

KATHY BRAZEE: Well I think it gets to if there are specific types of publications online, different file, different formats, and if there are any experiences at your institutions where you actually do -- select out certain types of things that you harvest in a special way. I'd be interested in those -- feedback about that as best practices.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Anyone what to comment? Kathy?

KATHY HALE: Kathy Hale, staff librarian, Pennsylvania.

I think, Kathy, that you're going to get just like when you asked for what we wanted digitized first, you are going to get a million different answers, because everyone of us have something that we'd like to see digitized first. I might make a suggestion that you put that on the next bi-annual review that that might be a question you might want to ask -- what would

you like to see harvested or what is not out there that you're missing.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Last question. Walt? What should GPO do with out of scope material accidentally harvested?

WALTER WARNICK: This is Walt Warnick, Department of Energy.

Throw out the trash as soon you have -- at the first opportunity.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Does council have any other?

ANN MILLER: This is Ann.

I'm confused by the last question. And I'm kind of confused by -- I kind of agree with Kathy's statement, but I'm not sure how we can ask GPO to include things in a project -- include things that we know they're going to miss in a project that hasn't started yet.

So maybe we should have like a priority list as opposed to, you know, what kind of things we know. Because I mean, frankly, I'm sitting here trying to think of what I can possibly think that would have to be manually harvested versus automatically harvested. I just don't have enough information.

DENISE DAILEY: This is Denise Dailey.

          I do. Well, no, by way of example, I'm going
to pick on the national center for education
statistics, and their library statistics program. And
in their benevolent wisdom decided across the agency
that they would -- to help the customers who come to
their page -- take a single report and break it into as
many parts as they possibly could and in as many
versions as they possibly could. So if you wanted a
text version rather than a PDF version of the report,
you can get that. If you want the whole report but no
tables, you can get that. If you want the tables
separate from the report, you can get that. And if you
want to download the data file, you can get that too.

          So when you go to the new bibliographic
records for these reports, instead of having one link,
they have seven or eight links. And they have a new
format. The ED tab is gone and it's been replaced by
another document which I now can't remember the name
of, but it's only 14 pages long, because there is a
page limit on the publication now.

          So instead of having all those data tables
that we're so used to, that's actually published as a
separate document from the -- the analysis is separate
from the data itself. So they've enormously
complicated it, enormously complicated it.

So what would have to happen I think, and I guess in my mind I use this as an example only that I think there's a point at which something -- a series of -- determining whether a website should be manually or semi-manually harvested, likely may being as manually harvested, then determining how it's formatted so you can make a more intelligent semi-manual harvest in the future, so that you have to make the system smarter as you move forward. And it's going to take a human to look at that to determine what it is exactly you want snatch from the page.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: It seems like there's three different things going on here. One is the question of frequency of harvest, and, you know, if the frequency isn't regular enough, then that's something that potentially can be [inaudible].

The second thing is the question of whether it's worth more time to worry about defining scope for the harvesting before you do the harvest or worry about the scope of the cataloging after the fact.

If NCS has made some major changes in a regularly occurring publication, you know you want that publication. Maybe you don't want to spend as much time cataloging at a low level. You want to acknowledge that this thing exists that may have a new

fundamental home page even though it's broken into parts.

I guess I'm just -- I'm really worried about so much time being spent on defining the scope that the harvesting doesn't happen and the material isn't acquired.

And my real worry is the quantity of information that I don't know about, that I don't discover in my daily activities, that I don't find in the catalog. And I feel much better if the stuff gets captured first and it's least there and searchable in some format even if that format is wholly incompatible with its previous existence as often happens the physical materials.

We have a few minutes left, and I have some general questions about this, but it didn't fall under the questions you guys set up. So I wanted to ask a couple of them.

Go ahead. Well, since we have a few minutes. The first one is, the 25 percent of documents that were partial, why were they partial do you know? I mean why did you get these, you know, partial things -- just curious.

MATT LANDGRAF: This is Matt Landgraf with GPO.

I just want to be clear that when we say the 25, you know, and that's a rough estimate.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Oh.

MATT LANDGRAF: I don't think we know the real number, but those documents that we consider partial really has to do with the way the information was reported back from the contractor. It was basically URL by URL. That doesn't mean, however, that the entire publication that an individual document belongs to wasn't harvested within -- within the pilot.

So, you know, we could have, you know, 50 individual documents that would comprise a publication within the population of our harvested content.

Does that make sense?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Yes.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Not quite, but that's [inaudible]

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

My experience with web harvesting is that what you get is a bunch of information, but what you don't get are the links that make that information intelligent in tying that stuff together. So you may have the appendix over here. You may have a table of contents over there. The links that tie it all together are what help to make sense out of it. So

just pulling in information isn't necessarily enough.

MATT LANDGRAF: Yeah. We actually -- this is Matt Landgraf again. We actually throughout the pilot, we considered that more and more of an issue during the actual pilot and had the vendors take a first stab at sort of tackling that problem using the directory structure of the website and the logical formation of the URL's, but I think more work needs to be done in that area especially because it wasn't actually part of the original pilot, the original statement of work that we went out with.

KATHY BRAZEE: This is Kathy Brazee from GPO.

Just following up on that a bit, in one case I saw a PDF representing the entire publication, but on that particular EPA sub-agency website, they'd also highlight chapter six, and that was harvested as a separate file by the vendor, so there are those kinds of instances where the crawlers are just the following the set up of the web page and the presentation. So we would obviously want the entire publication.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Any questions from council?

I have one last one. So what comes next?

MATT LANDGRAF: This is Matt Landgraf with GPO again.

We -- as you know, the main focus of this session was really the management of harvested content. You know I think that's really sort of the immediate concern right now, but we -- we're currently sort of in the planning process of what to do next.

You know there seems to be a lot of different methodologies and a lot of different ways to do web harvesting. And I don't know if we want to necessarily leap into doing another pilot right this second until we have sort of a better consensus on what the best practices and methodologies would be for harvesting.

We got you started in some conversations with some groups where, you know, like other federal agencies are trying to tackle these, these harvesting issues as well, and hopefully come up with a set of beset practices or recommendations for how to, you know, sort of handle harvesting with methodologies in the future.

So, in summation, yes, we would like to continue pilot activities, and we're exploring doing more piloting activities, but the actual details of what that pilot will look like are I think are yet to be determined.

WALTER WARNICK: This is Walt Warnick from the Department of Energy.

Whatever path you choose, I would recommend that the metric of success be that you've made a significant quantity of government information searchable that was not searchable otherwise.

And when you've done that, when you have the significant quantity of information searchable, you have succeeded or at least begun to succeed. And until you do that, you've not succeeded.

MATT LANDGRAF: This is Matt Landgraf.

I completely agree. I think -- and that's one of the core things that FDsys is supposed to do in the future is to make all that contact searchable and accessible.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Any other, council? Audience? Oh, I'm sorry.

TIM BYRNE: This is Tim Byrne.

And I wish I had a really nice statistic to say like that every minute seven web publications disappear forever, but, you know, it's true; it's happening. And we really just want to encourage that you move forward as quickly as possible.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Okay.

McKINLEY SIELAFF: McKinley Sielaff from Colorado College.

And maybe it's my naive understandings of a

bunch of different pilots going on, but I'm just

wondering yesterday, I heard about locks. We hear

about FDsys. Now we're hearing about harvesting. I'm

wondering how -- it seems like there's advantages and

strengths to all these different things that when they

are combined, they could solve some of these problems

instead of looking at these things and as isolated

little projects. I'm just wondering if that's

something that you all are thinking about -- how to

bring these different strengths of these different

software and programs together?

MATT LANDGRAF: I think that's really what

we're trying to do is really to sort of have sort of a

core mission in mind and sort of a targeted group of

functionality and sort of ways to solve problems.

So I mean we've actually taken a lot of steps

to align a lot of these projects together. I mentioned

yesterday that the harvesting pilot and the continuing

technology discovery are very, very closely aligned,

and the overall goals of FDsys are definitely -- are

definitely in mind when we're moving forward with the

technology discovery and web harvesting.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Can you go to the mike

just so that they can record that?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I was just following back up and asking about locks again, and we're having lots of talks across the country about how to distribute, you know, collections. I mean that maybe we don't need so many regionals and yet we're talking about collection development and growth of different places holding on and being experts, and I'm just wondering -- I mean it seems like locks is the way of doing that, but I'm not hearing GPO talking a lot about locks. Yet it seems like to me that's a fabulous program.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing Office.

GPO is very supportive locks. We had a locks presentation on Sunday as well. Just a little bit of brief history, GPO engaged in a locks pilot project as really one of our first wording experiences to help us find and validate our requirements for the future digital system. And going forward in conversations with the library community, the feedback that we have received in terms of technology selections for things like what locks can offer in the future or to make sure that they're -- you know, I call them the essence, scalable, sustainable, supportable based on standards like a lot of other things.

At the end of the day, we may very much find that locks solves a lot of these problems as we go forward with FDsys.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Okay, last question.

STEVE WEST: Steve West, Penn State.

I guess the thing that I want to communicate is the urgency of your harvesting, and the urgency of your needing to harvest. And just so you sort of understand where we're at in terms of our library catalogs, you know we're pumping in 200,000 records. Our catalogs are not clean anymore. We're moving to a good enough standard. The reason why Google, the brilliant Goggle, is that they said it was good enough. And I think that really if we can stress the fact that harvesting is vitally important and that if we get hung up on trying to make this a perfect, clean, neat, nice thing, we're never going to get it done. And there has to be sort of a -- we need to set a good enough standard of how we do this.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Thank you. That was a great way to close it. Thank you, GPO.

(Off the record from 2:59 p.m. to 3:33 p.m.)

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: -- by Marian Parker, and as I mentioned on Sunday, she got ill right before council meeting, and so Jeff Swindells, the typical incoming

chair role, gets to pinch hit, and then as I said,
we'll do the open forum as long as that goes, and then
we'll get into the council recommendations.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay. This is your
chance to ask a question about anything. That's why it
is open. We have a [inaudible] before us, members of
GPO. We're here to answer all of your questions and
they're probably connected back to the home office and
they can always ask the people who really know. And
you can also ask questions of council.

So, together, fire away. I say "fire away,"
and, of course, it's been --

SANDY McAninch: I promise not to fire. This
is Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky.

I was concerned about issue number four under
digital distribution, and some of the wording there
about depositories not having a preservation and
conservation charge from GPO. I suspect you meant to
say selectives don't.

If you look at digital distribution, we kind
of had to cut that conversation off, and there are four
issues related to digital distribution, and number four
ends with -- or as a practical matter, selective and
regionals will only be required to retain the digital
files, et cetera. It's analogous to requirements for

maintenance and care of tangibles. [indecipherable] to exercise for preservation and conservation techniques are not an FDLP requirement. However, in your new preservation chapter in the handbook, it does require regionals to do preservations. So I hope that wording can be specified -- be clarified.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin with the Government Printing Office.

Sandy's correct. The issue in the digitization -- digital distribution should have been requirements for selectives, and indeed there are requirements for regionals.

GEORGE CARLSON: I'm George Carlson with Santa Clara University.

I just want to make a follow-up on something that was said this morning about pushing digital files to entities other than depository libraries like commercial entities, the Government of Kuwait -- I don't know who all. That could be, you know, maybe set up as a subscription with GPO sales, and then that would be yet another little carrot to keep depositories in the system if they, you know, get those push files they always don't get.

TED PRIEBE: Thank you. Ted Priebe.

Just to reaffirm what we were trying to

indicate over there this morning as well, the
capability is certainly there. It's going to really
come up to a GPO policy that we need to reaffirm on how
that will be implemented, but I certainly the aspect of
the carrot approach, and we will reaffirm that with
policy. Thank you.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski
from the California State Library.

My comment is again on this morning's topic
of digital deposit of files.

There was nothing -- if I'm wrong, you know,
I don't always read things fully or correctly -- but I
see nothing in this paper about access to deposited
digital content after it is deposited in either
selective or regional libraries. Now, there was
certain analogies made to the tangible world and Title
44 requirements this morning -- analogies such as
keeping things for five years and, you know, how to go
through which drawing of digital deposited files and
that kind of thing.

Of course, part of the responsibility of any
depository receiving tangible or digital files pushed
to them from GPO is providing public access to those
files.

Now my question is if you fast forward into

the future, to the future digital system, it's fully

operative and have a system where we are depositing

digital files into depositories around the country, are

those depositories going to be responsible for

providing access to their files and their content, or

can they use the future digital system to do that and

are we really talking about depositing electronic

content or preservation and sort of a safety net

situation where we're not really talking about

accessing those files except in an emergency?

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

There were lots of questions there, David.

Let me start with the one I stood up to answer.

And that is the question about access, and we

did make the analogy to -- should you receive materials

through a digital deposit scenario that the Title 44

obligations and obligations of being a depository

library would hold, and, of course, the foundation of

it all is that access. So access is there.

And then you were talking about whether or

not you would be getting preservation level or access

level derivatives. Was that your second question?

DAVID CISMOWSKI: You're right, Cindy, I

asked a number of questions. I'm sorry.

The access -- my access question is, if you

imagine the future digital system being fully

functional two, three years in the future, would a

library where these digital files have been deposited,

would that library have to provide access to their --

to the files under their custody if they could get

exactly the same content from the future digital system

remotely?

        CINDY ETKIN: Yes.

        DAVID CISMOWSKI: Wow.

        CINDY ETKIN: Yeah, because it -- because in

Title 44, when you receive something through the

depository library program, you have to make it

accessible.

        DAVID CISMOWSKI: Even if exactly the same

content is available from the future digital system?

        TED PRIEBE: Ted Priebe.

        Again, I think we've got two different

things. We focused, or I focused today on Title 44 and

what we currently interpret that to be two to three

years from now what our oversight does. What our

general council will support in terms of interpretation

could be a totally different thing, but in today's

terms with Title 44, if FDsys were to push those access

derivatives in type of scenario, it would be the

requirements to provide that access as well as the

retention and/or other things.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: You see one of the reasons
I asked this question is because when I think of the
number of documents that were retrieved through the EPA
crawl, which I've heard is in excess of 200,000
documents, when I think of direct digital deposit, I
think of unrelated documents maybe with control numbers
that are assigned sequentially just streaming into
depositories that are going to deposit these. They're
going to come in in random order; they're not going to
be organized at all. How are those depositories going
to provide access to the copies that they have on their
server when there's a very robust, presumably, robust
search engine and retrieval capability in the future
digital system?

TED PRIEBE: Again, Ted Priebe.

I've got to try to pull this thing out, so I
can't believe it. Sorry. I wish I had a second
microphone. I've totally threw myself off now. I may
have forgotten the question.

It seems to me that perhaps the question
might be from a depository itself, do they need digital
deposit to support their community or from a policy or
an internal perspective that you feel like FDsys is
robust enough that people can access and easily select

and have full mechanism for the content that they need
when they need it. Digital deposit is an option, not a
mandate at this point, so that was my intent in terms
of how to scope that discussion. I'll defer to
[inaudible].

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis from GPO.

Don't -- feel free not to sit down.

If I could just make an add to that, when we
were talking about the future of the Federal Depository
Library Program this morning, one of the important
topics was the need for redundancy, and there was the
issue about not necessarily trusting GPO and trusting
that GPO will have funding and that GPO will be there
in the future. And just from prospective, I think that
redundancy in relation in relation to the FDLP going
forward is important for both access level files and
preservation level masters.

ANN MILLER: Ann Miller.

I think maybe -- and maybe I got the wrong
end of the stick on this, but as I understood it, we're
talking -- when we talk the general deposit, we're
talking about two types of files. There was the, you
know, upgraded -- basically it's a publication
electronic format, it's a PDF with metadata that you
get, you store on your server, you load the metadata

onto your system, and you have it.

Then there's the preservation master copy more of a raw file that you can house, maintain in a different manner. And I think that's what some people are wanting to do.

To me, the current equivalent, you know, is, yes, you would have to provide access to that if you get it. It's a bit like saying you select the Federal Register in print, but because it's online, you don't let anyone look at the print. I mean that -- I don't think that's where we want to go. But that was my understanding is that we're talking about two different -- when I think digital deposit, if they're pushing something to me, they're pushing a fully fledged file that I can put on my server, they provide the metadata that I can add to my catalog, and it is integrated similarly to how I would integrate a print publication that I've received with the same rights and responsibilities that I have currently.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

I think the question is more along the lines of okay, I've got the files, now what do I do with them. What applications do I use to access that information?

ANN MILLER: Well, if it's a PDF file, for

instance [inaudible]. If it's in -- you know, and some
of that would be up to the institution. It's kind of
like saying, "I get it. I've got the box of books. Do
I use Sue-doc or do I put it in Dewey?" It doesn't
matter as long as you provide access.

PETER HEMPHILL: I guess the question is, is
GPO going to provide tools for those regional libraries
to provide things like search or is it something that
the institution is going to be on their own to provide?

ANN MILLER: Well, they have it in the long
run. I mean that's the other thing is that, you know,
we've gotten historically we've gotten the print
things, and it's been our responsibility once it comes
in the door, they do the monthly catalog, they provide
cataloging, but I pay to get cataloging to put in my
system. I process it. I pay to have staff to put a
call number on it. The same administration costs are
going to be there. They'll just be different
administrative costs.

PAT RAGAINS: Pat Ragains, University of
Nevada, Reno.

I guess I'm a little confused, because when I
think of this playing out and also when I think of the
survey responses of libraries where only a minority of
the depositories that responded said that they would be

willing and able to support a download of depository publications.

But the thing of how this, as I just mentioned, might play out, you would have a situation potentially where regional libraries and selective depository libraries would be required to download and provide access to their downloaded copy of certain government publications, whereas another library which is not a depository in the same community could easily gain access through the CGP and the hyper link in the CGP without any of that baggage. Okay?

What is the advantage to remaining a depository in that sense? What is the advantage to the citizens and the users outside of the expertise of the staff? I mean in terms of downloading and providing access to the information. I'm not really clear on that.

TED PRIEBE: Thank you, Pat. Ted Priebe.

I think the key differentiation that I would make is that at this point we're not scoping digital deposit as a requirement, but rather an option.

And to maybe be more specific, an option that we're trying to get validation that it's of benefit to you, the community, for us to enable, because as any content management system or as the future digital

system requirements are validated, now is the time that we want to know, because every enhancement, every service that we provide with FDsys comes with a cost, and we make sure that we are prioritizing the right thing. So I don't that it's -- I would scope it as a requirement on you, but rather as a depository if you feel like that is a service that you need that benefits your constituents and your users that that would be enabled.

          PAT RAGAINS: Well, then I think it's probably very important to precisely state it that way and how that might differ from the current network of depository libraries, because while some redundancy is needed, I agree with that. It's not needed at the level of 1,400 plus depository libraries and 53 regionals I don't believe.

          GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Richard, did you want to --

          RICHARD AKEROYD: Yeah, this is Richard Akeroyd at the State Library of New Mexico. I think Pat said something that I think is probably one of the most important things for all of us to be thinking about as we move forward in this evolving environment. I think to think that the same rules that apply today are going to apply five, six, seven years from now. I

think that's wrong way to think, but because we know
that those rules are going to change as the environment
changes.

        But I think when Pat said other than staff
expertise, my feeling is that we should say that's one
of the staff expertise that we bring to this whole
evolving environment is exactly the point, and it's not
an "other than;" it's the main point that we should be
thinking about, because that's what we continue to
bring to the table.

        GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: One clarification. We
have not yet solved the regional issue in relation to
digital deposit and there -- and so we need to make a
decision on whether regionals will be required, et
cetera.

        If it is a voluntary program -- and I can see
many libraries deciding to use that push content to
integrate into other applications. For instance, we
might develop or we are developing a site that looks at
Missouri flooding, Missouri River flooding over time,
and so we might integrate the Corps of Engineers and so
get everything, for instance, from the two districts on
either side of your state.

        Ann?

        ANN MILLER: I have a question regarding one

of the slides that I saw on the FDsys presentation.
And I just want clarification.

When we were seeing a slide of what the FDsys
search might look like -- I think it was the search --
on the left hand side, there was the blue band with a
list of links that included things like GPO access,
CGP, FDLP Desktop, and I think it was the GPO home page
and then guide to government.

My understanding or my thought was that the
FDsys was going to subsume GPO access, and that
concerned me a little bit to see that there when I
thought that the FDsys was going to replacing GPO
access. I have a little big of a bee in my bonnet
about GPO access right now. After doing some
historical archival work in the Depository Library
Council minutes -- well, anyway, can somebody explain
that to me?

LISA LaPLANT: This is Lisa LaPlant from GPO.
What you were looking at was a template for the 1-B
screens, so that wasn't necessarily what 1-C is going
to look like. So the links over on the left were
strictly for 1-B only. And what we were saying is that
the GPO application functionality will be subsumed by
FDsys.

ANN MILLER: Can you give me some idea when

in the release time line that would occur?

LISA LaPLANT: Release 1-C.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: I have a question for
GPO. First, to clarify an assumption, I seem to recall
that with FDsys you guys were not going to include
data; is that correct? I seem to recall that you guys
were not to include it -- so, yes, I know, I'm sorry.
Numeric data, that's correct. I don't think of any
other kind.

Do I have an answer yet? I'm sorry.

SELENE DALECKY: The answer to that would
"yes." The answer would be "no." It's different from
--

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This isn't confidence
building.

SELENE DALECKY: Well, from a functional
perspective and a policy perspective, you're talking
about two different things. I mean -- what -- this is
Selene Dalecky by the way.

The -- what we've been concentrating on is
publications, the final published version of federal
documents and so if you're doing a comparison of the
scope of the final published version versus numeric
data and databases, that's changing and is maybe not
static. It's a different set of information. So in

terms of what we're focusing on now versus what we may

be looking at in future releases, right now we're

concentrating on the file published version of the

government document.

ANN MILLER: That's a no.

SELENE DALECKY: That's the current scope for

the current releases that we have mapped out. We don't

have it included. But it doesn't necessarily preclude

that happening in the future.

ANN MILLER: I think my comment on that would

be that I sense from GPO and from the depository

community a desire to have the FDLP continue on.

I think perhaps the most -- the carrot I see

you guys having right now -- the big carrot -- is this

push, which I find kind of, you know, this is the push.

Pushing information out will be your carrot for people

to belong to the FDLP.

I think the most valuable thing you could

push is data. That's probably from my perspective, and

it's probably pretty unique, but that's where I think,

you know, when Pete's talking about industry and

business, wanting something pushed to them and maybe

that being a subscription item or whatever, I suspect

it's data and not publications that they want.

TED PRIEBE: This is Ted Priebe.

Could --

ANN MILLER: And not data publications.

TED PRIEBE: Could you define data just to help maybe understand? I think that was at least why I paused initially. I didn't completely understand the scope of the question, but define data.

ANN MILLER: Well it could be something that you would define probably as a publication like the current release of CPI. Come out this month, people want that pushed to them. They probably want it pushed in the Excel format and in a, you know, kind of delimited format of some sort.

PETER HEMPHILL: Or for another example of what I actually used was NTIS data and detect data in file forms, folded down across, correlated it to our information.

ANN MILLER: American Community Survey, Fact Finder.

STEVE HAYES: Some of the census stuff is exactly that. I think you can mix the two in terms of as what was said, those changeable databases that bring a lot of stuff together on a dynamic basis and display it back to you, it would be hard -- this is Steve Hays at Notre Dame --- would be hard for you to treat as a "publication." However, there are distinct data sets

of finite -- the housing survey, most of the Census
Bureau's content that would be useful in a numeric --
they're not changing, they're not growing, they're not
shrinking.

It's simply this is as published, and you
would take it and apply other tools to it like we would
anything else that we would have in our toolkit within
the library, be that a human who says "Yes, I know
these publications to Excel, D-Base, SPSS, SASS,
something else, but those are finite sets that I think
would somehow you'd be able to define to fit into the
program would be there to.

I would hope the answer would be "yes, it's
there, but it's on the next pass of what we're going to
capture for you."

ANN MILLER: This is Ann.

If you would just look at the Bureau of
Economic Analysis page, any of the Federal Reserve
Board pages, a lot of them. You could look at the
Census Bureau page, perhaps not American Fact Finder,
but certainly the publications, most of the current
population reports; those are the kinds of things. Let
me see, U.S. Geological Survey material, water data,
that sort of thing.

Data is our life. Data are our life in many

of your depositories. We provide the fundamental data for economic analysis, for regression studies, for students learning how to do regression studies, for geographic and geological research, for environmental research. This is important, and the answer has got to be "yes" and soon.

DENISE STEPHENS: This is Denise Stephens.

And I wanted to followup a little on what Ann and couple of other folks have said.

It seems that there's two things that need to happen here. One is, yes, the stuff needs to come, but also they may need to be an opportunity taken advantage of here after the first pass of the system to work with the community to determine is there a core data set? Is there a fundamental set of information in numeric form that is useful out there, because those of us who have worked in this community, we can run off a list of 20 without thinking about it.

The fact of the matter is that the difference between the publication and the data is that in one form somebody's telling me what the outcome is. In another form, I can define my own question and shape my own outcome, and both of those I think should be possible.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Amy with the two hats.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I just wanted to say that if you want to know what kinds of things are relevant, you can look at the CD-Rom products that you've been distributing to us for years. We've got the better part of a cabinet full of those materials.

The other thing I want to say is that while it's always nice to have the material in formats like Excel and in SPSS, because that does save time, always, always, always make the preservation copy non-proprietary, file format and clearly defined metadata attached.

JEFF BULLINGTON: Jeff Bullington, University of Kansas, another person who wears government information and data services.

A good guideline and a place to start looking would be the OMB publication, manual publications, statistical programs of the United States which outlines the roughly 80 different agencies that spend half a million dollars a year or more in generating statistics and data that it's a primary part of their mission, so it's a good place to look to start to identify some of these big major areas.

And given the federal government is spending about five and half billion dollars a year on this, it really is important stuff that -- and that might just

be one place to start looking.

I also agree and recognize that that probably isn't a first level priority; there are other things to work on. But I want make certain that we're considering it as we move toward, particularly given some of the new things that are emerging out of NSF and NIH with regards to managing data and making that publicly available in one fashion or another in the future that may or may not fall within the FDLP, but might be something to think about.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office.

I just wanted to say something about numeric data and whether or not it'll be in the program. And there is a precedence for having numeric data in the FDLP. We've delivered it to depositories in the format of CD-Rom, and if we look what's on the CD as content and not the delivery mechanism, that, yes indeed, numeric data would be in scope of the depository program. And whether or not it's going to be the focus as Selene mentioned as the first part of that test is another question, but certainly would be in scope of the program.

LOUISE TREFF-GANGLER: Louise Treff-gangler [phonetic], University of Colorado at Denver.

Once all these documents are in the FDsys program, will they be retrieval through Google and other popular search engines that the general public will be using.

TED PRIEBE: The answer to that is yes, unequivocally.

MARY MARTIN: Mary Martin, Libraries of the Claremont Colleges.

I'd like to back up a little to one of the assumptions made this morning or earlier this afternoon, and I'd like to ask a question.

It was stated in one of the assumptions that GPO would determine what harvested material was not within the scope of the depository library program. And I was wondering first of all how GPO is going to do that if, for example, 200,000 documents were harvested from the EPA website, and I'm wondering how GPO would determine which of those documents would fall within the scope of the program and which would not. And the second thing would be if you have some sort of way of determining -- I seriously doubt if you're going to have somebody look at all 200,000 documents, so I don't know if you have some mechanized way of doing that. And if you do, why would you not put that filter up front so that you would not be harvesting documents

that are not within the scope of the program. You know

that was one question.

And then to add to that -- talking about this

data file situation -- this is really probably the bulk

of what the use I have encountered -- user needs of

government information or data files and then perhaps

legislative policy documents. But -- okay, so if data

files are what people want and the government is busy

in its desire to be helpful -- and I would include the

Census Bureau and the Department of Education as good

examples of that -- they are taking what formerly used

to be publications like the digest of education

statistics and publications like that, and they're

taking them apart into files to make it easier for us

to download or the public to download files of certain

types of data that it wants.

Again, it seems like GPO is going to be, you

know, a victim of your own success in that if you're

only looking for publications and you're bringing

tables or files that the agencies have so kindly broken

up for us, how would you -- or would you even attempt

to put those back together for us?

And then that would take me one step further

back to my original question of is this -- do we really

need to have this done. And I would say if some of

this could be done, you know these -- it absolutely

probably would be nice to have the files put back

together in a publication -- I doubt if GPO could do

that, but I guess my question is are you thinking about

delivering information in this way? Is there an

understanding of how libraries and users actually use

the information?

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi, this is Kathy Brazee from

GPO. Sorry, that was kind of loud.

Let me try and remember all of the questions

about harvesting. Matt Landgraf is not here from FDsys

-- to represent FDsys, so if anybody wants to jump in,

please do. And, Laurie, if you want to jump in

relating to cataloging, please do.

The pilot was set up with three different

crawls so that we could tweak what we called and the

vendors called the rules and instructions for

harvesting after each crawl to better capture those

publications within scope. We were trying to automate

the process that GPO has used forever relating to

determining whether or not a publication is within

scope of the FDLP, which is a publication of public

interest or educational value. And trying to tell an

automated crawler how to do that is a challenge, and we

had a whole long list of suggested parameters we gave

the vendors at the start of the pilot, and that's an

attachment to the white paper on the amount or the Matt

is the primary author of.

In terms of review of the whole boatload of

documents that came back, it was a pilot project. We

know that one of the challenges of harvesting is that

it could potentially bring back this really

unmanageable volume number of publications. It's

moving the bottleneck from discovery to description,

and certainly we want to discover everything before it

might be taken off a website.

We're certainly very aware it's moving the

bottleneck and trying to find ways to manage that.

Yeah, and there are going to be several different

options or several different mechanisms pursued to

provide bibliographic control or metadata over the EPA

documents that are found. Of course, we need to make

sure that they're complete publications in their

entirety as well.

So because it was a pilot, we're going to try

and do as much review as possible. There are several

publications that came out of databases that are so

similar and that came from similar URL's, that if we

find one publication that is within scope, we can do a

search and try and get everything else that is very

similar in nature and make a general assumption to

begin with that if one is within scope, the majority

are within scope, and that'll help us progress along.

Anybody else wants to address harvesting?

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing

Office.

I just want to elaborate on a point that

Kathy made and something I think that Pete talked about

earlier that in many ways harvesting as a technology in

some ways is in its infancy. And I think we can come

up with our human definitions of what scope is, but

when you try to apply to those parameters, you get the

percentages that we saw as a result of this.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I just have one comment

about publications. We are in the midst of a

fundamental transformation of what publication means.

For those of us in large academic libraries that deal

with a lot of journals, well, we don't really think in

terms of journals anymore. We're starting to think in

terms of articles. And even journals now are thinking

in terms of articles which go up on their own, and

they're sort of you might say they're in a journal, but

it doesn't have an issue; it doesn't have a volume,

things like that.

So I think that that may or may not require

another look at Title 44, or it may be that our own

definitions of what publication means, even within the

boundaries of Title 44, is under pretty massive change,

so.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO.

And that's one of the things that Cindy

talked about earlier that we are going back and taking

a fresh look at how we interpret that definition in

Title 44.

And going back to the question also, I think

one of the things that Robin and her team are working

on is going through that categorization process of what

was retrieved from the harvesting process of the pilot,

and it addresses that question of trying to put those

pieces back together to determine what is a publication

regardless of how we're defining it in the future.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill.

Just a little insight having dealt with this

issue, we would received publications with links to

spreadsheets and parts lists and various things, and it

ended up that what we were dealing with were data

objects, i.e, files or large collections of information

and relationships between those files. And sometimes

you have to be careful what you ask for, because you

have technical practical limit of what you can

communicate and how you communicate it. So when you're

talking about large scale statistical collections of

information, you have to figure well how you can

collect that information, but how are you going to

effectively deliver that information.

So there are considerations and it be easy

for GPO I think to get refocused on too many different

avenues and paths, and so it's probably in my opinion

good that they are focusing on delivering publications

initially with data collections coming a little bit

later on if they consider that at the initial design.

Otherwise, if you had focused on too many things and

you're just not going to get anything. So there needs

to be a focus, focal point.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government

Printing Office.

I just want to expand on what Jeff said about

definition of publication and what Ric said about

looking at the scope and defining all of this.

And I think one of the other things that we

need to look at is how our agencies are defining

publication. And that direction comes from OMB, so we

need to look at their documentation as well, and it's

unfortunate that all the work that went into that

categorization of government information recommendation

went nowhere.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, we have time for maybe one more question -- something you're burning to ask? Good.

McKINLEY SIELAFF: McKinley Sielaff, Colorado College.

I'm going to change tracks just a little bit. Because we've had a lot presentations about really specific sort of technological sort of things, one of the things GPO talked about as well was providing some training, and I guess I'd like some more information about what areas of training you guys are sort of thinking about.

And if I could make a plug. When I started out as a documents librarian, I was really focused on reference. And in the second half of my tenure as documents librarian, it really shifted into knowing a lot more about technical services, especially cataloging kinds of issues and dealing with loading records into my system. And I can go get some cataloging training, but very rarely, you know, is there just stuff about Matt's catalog training or some of the formats that we have to deal with that are separate or some of the serials cataloging issues that we deal with in documents versus sort of straight

serials kind of cataloging.

So I mean those are the kind of plugs that I would be really interested in training, and just wanted to overall let you guys start thinking about doing more training.

LANCE CUMMINS: Lance Cumming with the Government Printing Office.

We're -- you know we've just acquired the ability to use Opal and present some virtual training, and we're still looking at what we can do with that. We're still looking at the possibility of what training we can do but sending people out, but being under the continuing resolution and budget restraints, we have to really watch our travel in that aspect. So we're open to suggestions to what the community wants and needs. So feel free to just send those in.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Last question then?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: It's not really a question more than, you know, given all the GPO folks it's really nice and refreshing to see everybody, and I just wanted to say thanks for Ric making everyone available, because it's been a while since we've had an opportunity to see a lot of the faces behind the curtain. And it's nice to see everybody, and I appreciate the fact you're all here and made yourselves

available.

I was just wondering if the GPO choral unit has a version of Village People or the YMCA or We Are the World or something that you guys want to perform.

I guess the other comment, serious comment, I wanted to make is that, you know, there's been a lot of discussion on T-44 issues and what not, and I think we all agree, particularly those of us who have been around for a while, that there is a need for redefinition of publication in T-44. And I think it comes from a collective involvement with not only the folks from GPO but the community, because it's really Congress that we're going to have to plead out case before. And I know you're working on that, and you've got 800 other things going on as well. But some of us are here to help you work on T-44 redefinition.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis from GPO.

Thank you, Dan, for those kind comments. And I mentioned during my speech that this is a great team to work with. I don't know if we're going to ever give American Idol a run for their money, but we'll see what we can do about that.

One of the things that I believe in a lot is transparency, and as we're pursuing new partnerships, new anything, we're going through a process in which we

share that information with council and major library

associations to get their feedback. And I think we're

going to need to do the same thing as Cindy and the

group at GPO are working with us to come with our

interpretation of language that exists in Title 44.

Just one more thing that I wanted to add in

relation to going forward before we wrap up is that I

wanted to thank John Schuler, Cindy and Joann Knight

for giving a great presentation on government

information online yesterday, and that is a partnership

opportunity as well that GPO is interested in pursuing,

and we will likewise get the necessary internal

approvals and share out any type of arrangements with

you, the community, to get your feedback on that before

we do go forward.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Well, thank you. Can you

hear me? There we go.

Well, we want to spend the remaining 40

minutes -- council yesterday afternoon, but also prior

to the meeting started to develop some recommendations.

I want to get a little bit of background

before we get into this next segment. Jeff's going to

go through them.

I just want to give a little bit of

perspective as where we've been since we completed the

vision document and submitted it to GPO in the fall,
and also with all your input, we know that there's been
a frustration not only within council, within the
community and maybe also within GPO that the vision
document didn't have was an action plan. And we've
been struggling with that concept that it was just a
vision.

And we still, we've been struggling with that
and that we feel that we're close to really embarking
on that important part of action. We thought the first
good step again would be to get back to making some
recommendations and in making these recommendations,
wanted to set some priorities.

GPO has a lot of initiatives going right now.
And it seems that all of these initiatives are
worthwhile and they are for the better of pushing the
program forward, but it times it seems they're chasing
an awful lot and not getting very far.

So, again, these recommendations I want you
to look at them in the light that it's in support of
the team that's been at GPO, that continues at GPO,
because they're doing a lot of good work. And their
supporting council, and I think council wants to
support them. And the way that we want to support them
is that to tell them through these recommendations what

we think is important, what should be on the top of the
list. And these programs and initiatives get
completed, what's at lower down on the list. What can
become the next focus?

Again, there's a lot of reality into this.
GPO is functioning under a continuing resolution that
has pretty much flat funded them. Yes, I'd like to
commend GPO on going to the hill and asking for that,
the amount of money that they've asked for.

If you ever pull up some of the news sources
out of Washington, all they focus on is GPO's asking
for 48 percent more. We know the reality of this, and
we know the reality of the continuing resolution. But
that just doesn't play very usually outside the beltway
either.

The other thing I want to speak to this about
setting priorities is I don't want to see this list to
continue as a long-term priority list. The way that I
would see this priority list is at most going into and
through physical year `08. I don't want to see it get
stuck and put something like this in stone. I said
this to council yesterday. And this is a function and
when you -- your experience. I remember when the
priority cataloging list was created, and the
implications of that we still live with today. So I

think that this should be short term, short term
recommendations, and again I'll let Jeff start with
that.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay. I'm not going to
read all that, but essentially we knew that when we
delivered the vision statement that we were going to
have to move from vision to action. And so these both
-- well, you can't see them yet, but what we will show
you are both action items and a prioritized list of
action actions on current activities at GPO.

Number one, and all of these have the form.
We have the recommendation and then we have it broken
down by where GPO fits in this and where the rest of us
fits in this, where the FDLP community fits in this.

So recommendation number one, council
recommends that GPO expedite development of FDsys.
This includes corporation of content of the ways WAIS
platform. GPO's commitment to rapidly moving off the
WAIS platform is strongly encouraged. I added a word.
And I'll let you -- you can probably read the GPO part
and the FDLP part, but what I'd like to is sort of open
that open that up as that is our number one priority,
and see if council wants to weigh in on that at all;
otherwise, I'll open that up to the audience.

Ann?

ANN MILLER: This is, in my mind, the key, and I think it's one of the things we've been hearing from GPO that this the key.

But I must admit that when I heard Ted talking about the GPO access beginning to think -- we think we may have had a [indecipherable]; we may have a solution to moving GPO access off the WAIS server.

I thought, you know, I've been hearing that before. I've been hearing that as I've discovered since 2001, and I'm not happy. And so I think -- and I think I need to say that. I think that I'm a representative of the community. I've been hearing this forever.

This is a system that's essential to our nation's democracy. It's on an old outdated platform. I understand their issues. I understand their concerns. It has to be done. It has to be done as soon as reasonably possible.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Ready to move onto the next one. Oh, okay. Any comments? We'll move onto number two? Oh. All right.

MARY MARTIN: Mary Martin, Libraries at Claremont Colleges.

I was just thinking about what Ann was saying, and if the content on GPO access is to be moved

to FDsys, whatever you call it, I was thinking of an example of database or document or collection of documents, whatever you might want to call it. For example, the Code of Federal Regulations or the U.S. Code, and that is now accessible through GPO access. And given the definition of the document locations that we have for FDsys, how would we expect the Code of Federal Regulations to appear on the new system? And since it is -- we depend on it being constantly updated, how would that work? And there's many others.

There's the Federal Register and there's other -- but the Code is such a dynamic document, I'm really curious as to how that might work or might that be a candidate for some other application?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Does anyone from GPO want to weigh in on that?

Federal Register would be another example as something that has lots of pieces.

MARY MARTIN: I mean before we tell them to hurry up and do this, I think that we, as a library community, need to acknowledge that some of the things that we use and we find so useful for paper, and really are not probably anywhere near being ready to be moved to that platform.

KAREN SIEGER: This is Karen Sieger from GPO.

With regard to the CFR, were you referring to
the ECFR, the daily update of the Code of Federal
Regulations?

MARY MARTIN: Well, both. I mean the Federal
Register updates the CFR, but the CFR itself has been
updated annually. We receive a bound volume.

And that reminds me of one other thing I
wanted to ask and that -- that has to do with the paper
distribution or, you know, what paper distribution we
may still get in the future. And the Code of Federal
Regulations was I think was one of the things that was
on the list and probably should be even though I,
myself, wouldn't want to use it in a paper. I'd
probably go to Lexis or something.

But I'm not a public library. We have the
money for these databases, but the Code of Federal
Regulations, you know, we at least get that snapshot,
that once a year publication of it as it stands at a
particular time in one year, and they do it title by
title.

I don't know if you're familiar with all of
those documents. Librarians just know the colors and
all that. Okay.

And I assume that in public libraries, that
this would still be used. Okay. The Federal Register

updates on a daily basis, but then the Code itself they try to update once a year so that we have somewhat of a body of literature that we call the Code of Federal Regulations. I don't think any of us expect each daily update to be available to us in the Code of Federal Regulations.

STAFF MEMBER: I can speak to that on two terms. With regard what is currently available in WAIS, that data will all be available in FDsys, and you'll have it in the Federal Register with the list of CFR sections affected and the CFR.

So you'll still be to go ahead and get all the legacy data. You'll still be able to search all that data as part of our short availability project we've been going through and migrating the WAIS data into an XML PDF format, so we're trying to make it non-proprietary so it can be flowed into FDsys.

When it comes to things like ECFR, which is the daily update of the Code of Federal Regulations based on the Federal Register and the LSA, that is not initially in scope with FDsys, but will come online in a future release. And that goes back to what was said earlier with regard priorities for the system.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Recommendation number two. Oh. Recommendation number one.

LARRY MEYER: Thanks, Jeff. Larry Meyer, San Bernardino County Law Library.

Not disagreeing with my neighbor, Mary, at some point and if not in recommendation number one, maybe somewhere in the recommendations it might help to add version control and authentication, and I think that would take care of Mary's concern of the different versions of the CFR.

I'm not sure if the message came out, but in our particular field, it's important to know what the CFR was two years ago on this day, not just the current version. And I think if that can be incorporated somewhere in the recommendations, that would help.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay. Oh.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Recommendation number one.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I think -- that's okay.

BETH CLAUSEN: One little comment. Beth Clausen, Northwestern University.

And we recently had someone from RLG come in to look at our status and what we need to do to become a trusted digital repository. So I'm wondering if you really want that in there -- insure compliance with RLG/OCLC right now. I mean are you saying -- I mean if

we're expediting, that will slow it down. That's all.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I'm sure there are long ways of living.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Evelyn, did you want to --

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Yes.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: That was the preservation library.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: I think GPO needs to at least seriously consider becoming a trusted digital repository, and if through the FDsys is going to offer up authenticated materials, the development of FDsys -- let me backtrack a little bit. Is following the OAIS reference model, which is an ISO standard, it is in fact in its design building itself to be a trusted repository. However, the document that has been produced by the OCLC and RLG folks on the criteria and the check list for becoming a trusted digital repository, and this certification process for going through it will require organizational commitment in order to make it become a reality over time. And if FDsys is not intended to become the certified trusted digital repository, then what will take its place? What will be the function? Well, will GPO essentially contract that out to a third party? That certainly is

a possibility, but I think GPO needs to consider it,

and I think certification is a very important issue

that GPO needs to consider as it moves forward.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Ann.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Now those -- you know me

on this council as a preservation specialist. However,

I am a former federal employee, and the concept of

institutional will and institutional commitment has

long been under discussion within the federal

government. In terms of digital preservation, it is a

serious one.

And from my personal point of view, if GPO

isn't going to do it, who is?

ANN MILLER: As sort of the informal

secretary of council, could ask some of you folks from

the law community out there to give me a sentence

regarding authentication and version control that might

be useful to put into this initial recommendation.

I'm a little concerned about putting too much

detail in it, but I was thinking -- I mean you know

better than I what you're after, so if you could let me

know, that would be great.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I think that makes a

good point about this slow up things. I mean one way

to deal with this is to make sure that we want them --

we want certified -- we want GPO to be certified as a
trusted digital repository, but we might want to break
that out and have that later down the line, Ann,
because that is a long process, because we're trying to
go through that to, and it's [cross-talk] [inaudible].

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: This is Evelyn again.

I agree with Jeff. I don't -- I don't think
that GPO should not move forward while waiting for this
and just saying that there should be a parallel effort
to move forward.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay. Recommendation
number two: Council recommends that GPO review current
projects and initiatives with a goal of seamless
integration, interoperability and ease of access.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill.

What kind of drove this was yesterday's
demonstration showing multiple systems, not necessarily
all tied together.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Recommendation number
three: Council recommends that GPO harvest web based
documents hosted by government agencies. Council
attaches a high priority to the development and
establishment of a stable web harvesting program
integrated into systems currently under development.

Recommendation number four: Council

recommends that GPO establish a registry of depository librarians who are expert in specific parts or functions of the U.S. government. This registry would provide a list of depository librarians with expertise in subject areas who could be consulted by other depository librarians.

Walt?

WALTER WARNICK: Yes, this recommendation is a little bit different in nature than the previous three. Just the background probably -- we all know when the depository program was first created over 100 years ago, it was based on grand bargain. The government produced tangible documents, and provided them to libraries. Then the libraries preserve the essential function of disseminating that information to the public. This yielded a mutually relationship between GPO and depository libraries.

Nowadays, however, both ends of that bargain are falling apart thanks to electronic information exchange. Note that the GPO no longer has to have depository libraries for distributing electronic information. And 93 percent of GPO's information is electronic we learned a little while ago today. And GPO is, therefore, less dependent on libraries to be the disseminator of that information.

But just because the original bargain is falling apart, there remains great value in federal depository libraries. Just one example is the tremendous expertise residing in the form of people of federal depository librarians at these 1,200 libraries.

So what we need today very, very much is a new kind of bargain to sustain the mutually beneficial relationship between GPO and the federal depository libraries. And that's not an easy question to solve. Bruce James could not solve it. He tried. We, as a council, have struggled with this issue. We don't think that there is evident a grand bargain to sign onto that's new, but we do think there a lot of small steps that could be taken and adopted to being to develop a new beneficial relationship between GPO and the federal depository libraries that take us forward into the age of electronic information exchange.

This item here that talks about GPO establishing a register of depository librarians who are expert capitalizes on the new possibilities of electronic information exchange because it allows us to take advantage of the special expertise, the specialization of certain librarians at certain facilities and make that expertise available to other depository librarians, other facilities, who would have

expertise of their own, and they be registered in those areas, so that as a team, the collection would allow much more in depth knowledge about the federal government than we have now. It's a way of moving forward into the future and making things better. This is one step to make that happen.

And, incidentally, I would think as a manager of an organization myself, that I'd be impressed with the idea of having a librarian who was expert in one thing if that opened the door for me to export to experts throughout the country and other things that I was also interested in. So to me this also has a selling point to administrators. That's the first item on this list of action items which sort of begins the new process of paving a new relationship, a new beneficial relationship between GPO and the depository libraries.

TED PRIEBE: Thanks, Walt. Ted Priebe, GPO.

I think the one question that we need to look at on this is the definition of expert that is self-selected by committee. Maybe earlier in my career I thought I was an expert in a few things. As I got more experienced, I realized perhaps I wasn't. But, you know, in all seriousness, the issue of how we make that determination and make that available is perhaps a bit

of a quandary.

WALTER WARNICK: I would think that they'd be selected by the depository libraries themselves. You would get a name from a depository library recommending a librarian at that library, and you would post that name. That would be I think the first cut approach to this to get the thing going. And if you ran into trouble with that, you'd revise that concept.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth.

Last night when we were working on this, council also went over the concept of expertise, whether it's self-selected, whether it's community recognized, but there's also the expertise of the collections or the resources that individuals have access to. Access to certain quality collections usually mean that those individuals have some expertise in that or more than others. So, yes, we -- we do have to look at what expert is, but I wouldn't make it so narrow as not to endanger the creation of the network. And again, some of it will advance and decline as service by a certain expert or a certain group of experts will be successful and not successful -- word of mouth.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Laurie.

LAURIE HALL: Laurie Hall of GPO.

I just wanted to -- we're going to do a real quick thing on the new directory. We're going to add a couple of notes. This is probably just like a first cut at this, but we're going to put one note that's called special collections. You can go in and add under your directory information if you have a particular collection that you have in your area, and then probably another note if there's a, you know, a special reference thing that you do. So we will go back and do that for the first release, and you can add that information. So just the first step of doing that.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: I mean another example of this is when McKinley got up and said, you know, about cataloging expertise. There would be that exchange of information of who nearby feels that they have extensive cataloging experience, or if they've put something training, you know, that would help each other out.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Just note before I take the next question, just as the web has challenged our definition of publication, it is also challenging our definition of expert. And our usual systems for accrediting expertise may not be the same in the world of the web where people can go on and tag themselves as

an expert.

So I think we also -- but I think the question of who is an expert, what counts as an expert, is a very important question. And it may be we need to start looking at some of the web 2.0 technologies or reputational ranking, do people out there consider this person to have -- to be knowledgeable and competent in an area -- things like that.

So I think -- you're right -- I think this is something that needs real exploration.

Ann?

ANN MILLER: Just one last thing. I do think that what we saw with the browse topics capability might be one way of beginning to identify. You know certain people have expertise within the community as they contribute to those subject guides, and it sounded to me as though there would be some web 2 like community building potential in the browse topics. And then that gets back to wanting to integrate these kinds of things together so that we're not oh, like go here for the library director. I go here for browse topics. It's much more -- it needs to be more seamless than that.

KATHY AMEN: Kathy Amen at St. Mary's University.

But Bill just touched on what I was thinking that maybe a suggested rewording of the recommendation about instead of just expert in specific parts or functions of the government, make it broader than that and add expertise and methodology like cataloging whiz or web page design whiz or something like that. In other words, not just the subject expertise.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Good point.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I for one think that's an excellent point. Thank you.

TOM LINDSAY: I'm Tom Lindsay of the University of Texas at Arlington.

I'm not sure but I think they're about 114 agencies, independent agencies in the cabinet departments and all that sort of stuff in the government. We have a been a registry like that, or perhaps we are thinking of taking the budget, the total budget of the federal government expenditures, and the budget finance schools that appear in there finding people that are expert in areas like that, or the project to fit the catalog of federal domestic assistance categories, some of which run across a whole gamut of agencies like in one particular category.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: If the devil's in the details, we -- I mean -- how one classifies that is

going to be something that needs to be worked out.
[inaudible] those are all ways that one could go in and
classify it.

WALTER WARNICK: And I don't think they're
mutually exclusive either.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Right, exactly.

WALTER WARNICK: We could have experts in one
type of process if you will, and another type of expert
who is interest in specific programs like in the
Department of Energy you run the gamut from nuclear
waste repository in Nevada to getting alcohol from
cellulose and there's a lot of disparity both
organizationally within the government and
technologically on these types of things. So there's
plenty of room for experts of all kinds.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Thank you. Okay.
Recommendation number -- whoa -- small type.
Recommendation number five: Council recommends that
GPO coordinate and support item level cataloging of
digitized works to aid in the discovery of converted
resources. This should encompass a range of activities
as appropriate to particular projects, including some
or all of the following -- and then we have -- I'm not
going to read all of those.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

One thing I would like to emphasize here is that I don't GPO can go it alone with all the information that's out there. I think they're going to need to work very hard with partners to get all of this information in and to get it -- to be able to get it done in a timely fashion and be successful. I kind of view GPO's role as the tool provider, and if I could use an example like Wikipedia only with a difference in that GPO would be authenticating and certifying the people and/or institutions that are updating the information in their repository.

If you had certified experts or certified places providing all of this information and people in GPO reviewing that information for authenticity and official ness, if you will, then I think GPO's going to be much more successful by teaching the folks how to fish, rather than trying to give the fish to them.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Recommendation number 6: Council recommends that GPO partner with libraries and other institutions on digitization projects. Council further recommends that GPO focus its efforts on coordinating the dissemination of specifications for digitization and standardized partnership agreements. Libraries and other cultural institutions are interested in working with GPO but need clear guidance

on how to proceed.

And I think some of what's behind this is there's a lot of activity out there, but we need to make very clear what the standards are for ingest into the system and how that process works, et cetera.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill again.

I think it's important for GPO to actively market to the other agencies those standards and specifications, as well as to the people who would be certified partners so that there's a clear understanding in the community and your partners of where you're headed and what you're doing.

I think just the sheer fact of publishing those specifications, they're a lot of people out there going well, you know, we want to digitize this information, but should we do it "X" way or "Y" way or "X" way. If you have a specification out there, then that will make their job so much easier of the goal ahead.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Recommendation number seven: Council recommends that GPO provide an online venue for collaboration, communication, training and education for depository libraries. Council commends GPO's redesign of the FDLP web page and the potential for the development of education and training programs

in Opal.

Recommendation number eight: Council
recommends that GPO focus on specific projects
requiring unique treatments and with significant --
now, let me back up here.

What's missing here is this about
digitization.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: [inaudible]

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Yeah, oh, you've got it
over there, but -- okay.

Council recommends that GPO focus its
digitization efforts on specific projects requiring
unique treatments and with significant national value
as identified by Congress or the depository library
community.

Recommendation number nine: Council
recommends that GPO evaluate any assessment proposals
in the light of new expectations resulting from changes
in emphasis in the depository program.

Oh, go ahead.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: No, I just wanted to
point out -- we didn't really discuss this a whole lot.
You'll notice that underneath each one, we, of course,
have a GPO section, but we also have got a role for all
the libraries, because this can't happen alone and it

can't be on GPO's shoulders alone.

These experts, the collaboration, the training, the digitization, the priorities for FDsys and the things that GPO does really are going to happen with the help of depository librarians, and in some instances, a lot of help from the depository librarians and the depository libraries.

I think when Walt was talking about, you know, this new bargain, I think there are things that libraries can contribute and in the process gain some skills, develop recognition for expertise, be recognized as leaders and, you know, get things above and beyond what they have gotten in the past, the pieces of paper that have come in through your door.

So I think one of the things we really wanted to emphasize in this was this is, as the whole conference has been about, it is a partnership.

WALTER WARNICK: There was a common theme in these 10 recommendations. One is that all recommendations relate to the era of electronic information exchange, and number two, they have a role for GPO and FDL's and, therefore, each of them go a ways toward creating a new partnership and hopefully will last through the indefinite future.

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi, Kathy Brazee with GPO.

Thanks, council, for the recommendations.
I'm just hoping for some clarification on number nine.
In the first statement -- thanks -- in the first
statement, what are you thinking of when you mean new
expectations? By whom and of what?

And I realize we haven't had the session on
assessments yet. That's tomorrow morning.

And where it says "in the GPO section" where
it says "new components required to measure
performance," are you thinking of new ways to measure
performance and compliance to insure public access?
And does this relate in any way to the new handbook?

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth.

Yeah, I -- I think it relates a little bit to
the handbook, but I want to back up and say is what I -
- what I would interpret expectations is that the old
assessment programs focused on collections and didn't
focus on services, and that's what I mean when I see
the new emphasis and changes in the depository program.

Yes, we do agree that there has to be that
relationship between the handbook -- a little bit --
and assessment program. But there's a lot of expertise
out there now about assessment. Assessment has been
something that we've all been living over the last
five, 10 years, at least in academic libraries. And

it's becoming much more something that we're used to.

DENISE STEPHENS: This is Denise Stephens, University of Kansas.

To follow-up a bit on what Bill just said, closely related to the issue of assessing whether or not a library adheres to or complies with requirements of the program, it's equally important to know whether those requirements actually facilitate a service. Do this facilitate the kind of access to useful information that we're trying to bring about?

What we would like to see is a situation in which we have a better sense of comfort in knowing that all of the procedures that we follow make a difference in assuring access to information to the public.

KATHY BRAZEE: Thank you. I appreciate the elaboration so the session tomorrow will be even more meaningful.

ANN MILLER: Yeah, this is Ann, Ann Miller.

I think one the -- you know, we did write this knowing that we were going to hear more about assessment after we represented these.

But I think one of the other things that I was thinking about was as we do assessment in our libraries, and we all do it, that we start as depository librarians thinking about how we can

integrate our services into the greater assessment. So
when we're assessing reference, how are we assessing
depository reference. How do we identify how we're
performing and how our reference librarians are
performing and serving our public, serving our
students? How are we integrated into library
instruction and training?

These are all added value services that we
provide as depositories, and these are the things that
I like to be able to -- I need to be able to be
encouraged to think about not how many pieces of paper
have I processed. I need to be able to when the bi-
annual survey comes around give a real honest answer
about how many questions I've gotten in the last week
or month or whatever it is on the question.

So it's sort of a challenge. It's a
challenge more almost to us as a community to start
thinking about assessment more than just when the bi-
annual survey comes around or in the future when GPO
comes and asks us to assess our services. We need to
be doing it all the time or as much of the time as we
can.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Ric.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis from GPO.

I want to thank council as well for doing

these recommendations.

During my coming up on 15 years at GPO, this is something we used to do, and GPO found them to be very valuable, and I think we're going to find them very valuable going forward.

I also think that in line with Bill's comment about the continuing resolution, I think that these are things that are achievable for us. They're in line with priorities that we have before we left for Denver and the things that we're talking about today.

I want to talk for just a second about Ann's point at the beginning that I thought was well taken as well. I think that in the past, I think that GPO has sometimes talked about things they would like to do, but certain things haven't been delivered.

And part of what the team that you see before you is doing is we believe very strongly in transparency. We believe very strongly in doing what we're going to say we're going to do, and if there are things that we can't achieve, we're going to say that as well.

So I thank you again for the recommendations.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well, it's 5:00 o'clock, but before we go, I will tell you that this is a living document, and we encourage people to contact any of us

about this. It's being edited as we speak. You can

say this grammatical stuff especially.

　　　　And to take a page from our last speaker, you

can always e-mail me at swindellsg@missouri.edu, and

I'll make sure it gets to the right people.

　　　　Thanks very much.

　　　　(The session concluded at 4:59 p.m.)

STATE OF COLORADO   )

) ss.   CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF DENVER   )

         I, Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter and

Notary Public within and for the State of Colorado,

certify that the foregoing is a correct transcription

from the digital recording of the proceedings in the

above-entitled matter.

   I further certify that I am neither counsel

for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties

to the action in which this hearing was taken, and

further that I am not financially or otherwise

interested in the outcome of the action.

         In witness whereof, I have affixed my

 signature and seal this 30th day of April, 2007.

 My commission expires August 16, 2010.

_____

   Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE

APRIL 18, 2007

_____

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Good morning. Welcome to
Wednesday. We made it, as you see my smile is getting
wider.

I want to start with just a couple of
announcements. If you get home and you've forgotten to
fill out the evaluation form that was in the packet,
the evaluation form is on the Beta Desktop, so you
don't have excuse that the airline ate my evaluation
form.

The CEU certificates are out on the table, so
pick those up as you leave. And also, there's extra
handouts on the table and I'm sure Lance would like me
to encourage everyone to take a couple of copies so
that he doesn't have to pick them up and take them
somewhere. In my library it's called the little
blue -- well, the big blue bin actually. Since I have
newspapers in my department, we have big blue bins, so
okay.

If anybody has any announcements -- other
announcements that you want me to make just before the
break, just slip them up here to me.

I know a lot of people have a shuttles,

flights, and everything to catch, so while I have a

chance, have a safe trip home and thank you for

attending.

Our first session this morning is on

digitization and let's see. The presenters are going

to be Ted Priebe and Cindy Etkin and Tim Byrne. So I

think that's a little bit different than what we have

in the handout at this point. And Tim will start us

off this morning.

TIM BYRNE: So what I'm going to be talking

about today is -- I'll say it again, it being a

partnership, we're at a -- we have a project going on,

on digitizing technical reports. So we've been doing

it as a pilot project. We are hoping that when it

moves beyond being a pilot, it can be something we can

work a partnership with GPO on.

It involves digitizing technical reports so I

did want to give a definition of what really technical

reports are. I was going to ask, you know, how many

people really know what technical reports are and that

stuff and I said no.

How many people know what technical reports

are and wish they didn't?

[Laughter]

I think most document librarians look at

technical reports the way the rest of the library world
looks at government documents.

[Laughter]

So technical reports. Probably the first
U.S. Government technical reports series was the USDS
professional papers, the NDS technological papers. I
sort of almost hated to even mention USDS professional
papers because that's been a depository item for, you
know, quite a long time and most federal technical
reports were not included in the FDLP or cataloged in
the monthly catalog.

The Second World War is what really saw a
huge increase in the amount of research activity going
on in this country and a huge increase in the amount of
technical reports. So after the war, federal agencies
began sending technical reports to research libraries
around the country. So essentially they were a number
of depository arrangements set up by different
agencies.

I have a huge number of technical reports in
my collection, some of which I can, you know, trace and
say this is just because we were depository for the AEC
and we are depositors for NASA. A lot of it, I have no
idea how it came to us and, you know, why we have it.
I know why we have it. I just -- you know, how it got

there, I don't know.

Most libraries that began receiving technical

reports in the late '40s or early '50s still have those

reports in their collection and cataloged, little used

and taking up a lot of shelf space. And we know that

today's space is a major issue in libraries. Low use

collections are receiving new scrutiny. Replacing low

use print and microfilm collections with digital

collections is more and more popular and of course,

when you have a digital collection, it seems to get

more use than the actual, tangible collections.

So the idea of digitizing this material is

something we want to pursue.

Our story really takes us to the University

of Arizona, which like a lot of research libraries has

an extensive technical report collection. These

collections can be in different places in different

libraries. You know, in my library, there in the

publication section. At University of Arizona, they're

in the Engineering and Science Library.

And the associate librarian that assigns the

engineering library really started looking at these

things and said, you know, something needs to be done

with, you know, the amount of space this takes up.

They're really valuable resources, but they just don't

get used. So she really thought digitization, of
course, was the way to go. She started to list serve
on technical reports, trying to draw together people
with similar interests, did some surveys and
discussions and, you know, just really determined that
there was a lot of interest in digitizing this
material.

So she went to her Dean of Libraries, Carla
Stova [phonetic], discussed the -- what could be done
and Carla's recommendation was to submit a proposal to
GWLA. Now those of you who are not up on your library
acronyms, GWLA is not a large animal. It is the
Greater Western Library Alliance. It's 31 research
libraries in the mid-west and western U.S. It used to
be called the "Big 12 Library Consortium," which
Actually membership corresponded with the Big 12
Athletic Conference, which used to be the Big 8, and
before that was the Big 7.

[Laughter]

And library consortiums don't like to change
Their name every time they add a member, so rather than
Being the Big 31, they decided to be the Greater
Western Library Alliance.

They actually have a strategic plan and one
of the items in the strategic plans says to create a

program, an infrastructure for developing targeted

broad based digital collections that support

instruction and research at member campuses. So this

really fit what Milika [phonetic] and Carla were

trying, you know, to do so a proposal was submitted for

open access to federal technical reports to develop a

collaborative project with the Center for Research

Libraries to identify, digitize, archive and provide

consistent and unrestricted access to federal technical

reports issued prior to 1975.

So the date 1975 was picked just to say we're

going to concentrate on the older things since most of

the federal agencies that were doing digitization were

concentrating more on the more recent things.

The proposal went in, I think in April of

last year. It was approved by the directors in May and

a task force was formed in July. So Milika was really

the moving force on it. She's the Chair. The rest of

the members here in order of importance is -- no, no,

that's alphabetic order.

[Laughter]

Everyone here are from GWLA libraries with

the exception of Melissa Trivette [phonetic], who was

our liaison from the Center for Research Libraries, and

then John Sailor [phonetic], who is at Cornell. He's

not at GWLA Library, but he is a CRL. This did make
for interesting conference calls since Bob
Schwartzwalder [phonetic] was in Hawaii and he would be
coming in first thing in the morning and John would be
coming in on the calls late in the afternoon. Our
calls were also interesting because we did it all
winter and we have very diverse weather. Some of us
had extreme weather. Others had no weather.

        And you know, looking at the membership,
you'll see that it really primarily drawn from the
science and engineering libraries and I am the token
government documents librarian, but I came highly
recommended. And so also my role then is I'm the one
that gets to deal with all the federal agencies. For
some reason the idea of actually having to contact a
federal agency and talk to someone there is really
frightening to some of these people, but they are happy
to let me do it.

        The charge of the task force was to really
develop a pilot project with a sample set of federal
technical reports digitized and made freely available
and then used the data gathered in the pilot to propose
a cost model for digitizing and making available an
extensive collection of technical reports.

        The idea, of course, is that all over the

country, there are libraries with these technical

reports both in paper and in microfiche. We want to

give them the option of getting rid of all that. So

our objectives prototype collection, around 200

reports, we would use the GPO digitization

specifications and we'd provide open access and

persistent access; develop our cost model for a multi-

year digital conversation, costing out with the hosting

and the sustainability of the resources, and then we'd

also seek out stake holder approval and we've done an

interest survey that we sent to many, many lists and if

there is anyone here who responded to our survey, I'd

like to express my -- our appreciation for your

support.

        And then we had a budget and timetable. GWLA

gave us a budget of $65,000 and told us we had to give

them a final report in eight months, which was a pretty

tight timetable. So we had our first meeting in August

at the Center of Research Libraries. This is the Gant

table that we produced after two very intense days and

if we do nothing else, I felt we really accomplished

something just creating this Gant.

    [Laughter]

        It really, you know, shows what we needed to

do with the collection task, the IT task, the

administrative task. It gave us a timetable. We

didn't meet everything on our timetable. We, you know,

changed some things along the way, but this is pretty

much what we had, starting in August was our first

meeting. We met again in Kansas City in January and

then we did submit a final report in March. One of the

things interesting about that is that Milika, who is

really our driving force of this, was pregnant and

delivered in March. So she didn't actually give the

final report, but was sitting, waiting in the hospital

with her phone ready to answer any questions that might

have come up. And she actually wanted to come to this

meeting, too, and I said, "Don't be ridiculous."

But that was before she gave birth. I don't

think she's interested in coming now.

So our prototype collection, what we decided

on as our first title was the National Bureau of

Standards Monograph Series. That's a discreet set of

reports and was really highly ranked in the pre-project

survey that Milika had done. So when this one was

proposed, everybody was really happy with that.

Trying to decide on what to do next was a

little more of a challenge for us, but we finally ended

up deciding on doing Atomic Energy Commission. The

Division of Biology and Medicine had some various

sponsored series, so we took four small sections of
that and digitized that, also.

For the technology, this was hosted at the
University of Arizona -- of Hawaii. We decided to use
the Street Print Software as a public interface and
back in management system. We knew that this would not
be the system that we will use if we were given the go
ahead to, you know, go with the full project, but we
did not have the time or the real resources to really
go with what we wanted.

It was a big project. This allowed us to get
something done very quickly. It had limitations. It
wouldn't really handle a project the size that we
wanted to do, but it allowed us to really test what we
were doing and playing with the different file sizes
and working with our metadata, and then just working
out the workloads of assembling a collection to be
digitized and getting it to the vendor, getting, you
know, the database up, and of course, you know, with a
pilot project there were things that, you know, pilot
problems that came about that we had to deal with.

The -- just the way the report number is
filed was, you know, a challenge that we had to work
on. Limitations for some of the search options, the
software had a limit to four authors and anyone who has

done much with technical reports, knows that often
there are five, six, seven authors and a lot of times
people -- researchers today, when they find someone who
has done research in their area, they want to see
everything that person has done. So it's really
crucial to have all the authors indexed. So that is
something that we will be taking care of in our next
iteration.

And we also found that we had some problems
with the page counting estimates, which of course
affected the cost bids we got from our vendors. It
turns out that when we sent them the things, there were
more pages to be digitized than we had expected. So
that's one of the things we'll be working out in the
future.

So our structure -- one of the ways we
pitched this, of course, to the directors was as a
preservation project so we're preserving these
documents by -- we'll have all the TIF images stored in
two locations and these will not be things that are
made available on the web. They just be stored there.
Then we'd also have our print archives and of course,
as I said, the idea is that libraries all over the
country will be getting rid of their print material,
but we do want to have a complete set of documents that

one of the libraries will volunteer to keep so that there is always at least one set of print material. And then we have metadata that may be converted and marked for cataloging records.

In terms of access, we would have two institutions that would host the PDFs and then if the PDFs are corrupt in any way, we'd be able to go back to the TIF images and get the new image.

There would be at least one institution that served as the collection coordinator to assemble and prepare the collections to be sent to the vendors or to coordinate the digitization schedule and to work on the quality control checks.

That's sort of what we've been doing the last couple of weeks. And it's been interesting just within the committee what we're really looking for and what the quality and what is something we can accept. And what, you know -- we had sent collections to be digitized, but we didn't have the collection back to be able to compare it with the digital image so we didn't know if the image was poor because it was poorly scanned or poor because the original was in bad shape. So those are challenges that we are realizing we have to work out in the future.

So our implementation schedule is in phases.

What we would is in the first three years, it would be
a development phase. This would be working on our
database. Years four to six would be building where we
concentrate on digitization. Hopefully, there will be
years seven and plus for continuation of the
digitization, that this would go on as long as we were
to continue to get funding and there was interest in
the project. And then at some point, we'd just be
sustaining the site that we have the PDF files.

So the speed of the digitization is a
variable here. What we were proposing in the
development, we would try to be digitizing around a
million pages in the next stage, the building stage.
We would hope to do maybe three million is what we were
aiming for, but if there wasn't that much funding, then
we would be doing it at a slower pace.

Our cost model that we presented was based on
the fact that in our interest survey, we had received
responses from sixteen of the GWLA libraries, so we
gave a projection of just those 16 participating and
then also, if all 31 contributed. So the low end for
the development stage was $4,000 from each library.
The high end was 22,000.

I don't know why we really thought we were
really going to get anything more than the low end, but

we gave them those figures.

We do have the demonstration site up, so it is in the handout and I encourage you to go take a look at it. It's actually -- it's a pretty neat site and you know, give us any feedback that you have. In terms of the future of the project, the GWLA directors have agreed to contribute $4,000 to the task force for the next year, which gives us about $124,000 that we'll be working with. So as I said, we'll be developing our database trying to migrate from the street print to a better system.

We will be sending a representative to, I believe, the next meeting of the Cindy group of the federal STI managers. They're very interested in what we're doing and this gives us a great opportunity to make sure that there is no overlap between what we're doing. We don't want to digitize what they're doing. They don't want to digitize what we're doing. We don't think that there is much chance they're going to say that they have money that they can give us, but who knows? So we're trying to keep very positive about that.

We will pursue grant funding. There's been a couple that we've talked about already. So we may have in the future a much higher budget than what we've got

from GWLA.

The next collection to be digitized because we still have money in our budget right now for the pilot project. So we will be doing another AEC collection. This is the MDDC series, which is the Manhattan District Declassified Collection. This was distributed to libraries in 1948. It is indexed in the abstracts of declassified documents, but is not included in energy citations. So we will be putting this up. We also will be giving the files to DOE so that they can add them to their database also, and hopefully they'll start showing up.

So that's basically what we're doing. We'll keep you all informed as things go along.

RICHARD AKEROYD: I just -- Tim, I think I have two related questions. The first, back on one of your slides in your proposed structure, you talked about the possibility of creating brief records.

I think yesterday we heard a lot of brief record mentioned in various contexts and I'm wondering if you all have thought about what constitutes a brief record and is there -- are there any standards emerging as we all -- and I'm not asking you this necessarily, but raising the general question as we all seem to be dealing a lot with volume and how to process volume and

make it accessible and I think that word is going to

relate to my second question.

We're all talking about brief records and

getting stuff mass done, but I'm concerned about what

is or is not in a brief record and how that relates to

accessibility and what have you all done here by way of

getting access to these things once you get it into

your system?

TIM BYRNE: Yeah, we are getting -- we're

using the double core and we identified, I think it was

ten elements that would be standard that we would use

in each and I don't have a list, but these are the

basic, you know. And what we anticipate in the future

is that, say, when we are digitizing AEC material,

we'll be able to go to AEC -- or go to Austie

[phonetic] and download the records that they available

so we'll have -- we won't have to input that

information ourselves. We'll have abstracts.

So it will be a fairly rich record, even

though it is a brief record.

RICHARD AKEROYD: Thank you.

[Pause]

CINDY ETKIN: Another tall person.

Good morning and welcome to Day Four.

I'm going to talk to you this morning about

the NTIS GPO pilot project with access to DART.

A couple of goals of this pilot project: One is and I think one of the most important is to provide depositories with access to technical and scientific reports in the NTIS collection. The collection at NTIS is about three million volumes and what we'd be providing access to through this pilot project are all the publications that have online versions.

And looking at the NTIS collection and seeing how large it is, we also thought that it would be a good idea that we compare bibliographic records so that we might be able to identify any fugitive publications that we might go seek and bring into the depository program.

We've done a little preliminary work on this, but by far the most work so far has been in providing the access to the depository libraries to DARTS, but we did do some comparison of 2005, 2006 bibliographic records from both of the agencies and we had a little over 1200 bibliographic records that were technical reports that we compared and found that it was about a 58 percent overlap. So there are a lot of publications out there that we're not getting.

So what is DARTS? Depository Access to Reports, Technical and Scientific.

When we -- the first data project was called
"DART" and they wanted to NTIS wanted to keep something
very similar so we just added an "S" and then we had to
think of something. That's what we came up with and
when we were talking about DARTS, someone said, "Better
to be the dart than the target," so there we are.

So we've got the technical and scientific
reports. There are about 240,000 reports online dating
between 1964 and 2000. Again, the full text is online.
They are PDF files or TIF wrapped in PDF, a variety of
subjects and I think -- unfortunately, you know, we're
talking about technical and scientific reports, but
there are lots of other kinds of reports that are
available at NTIS as well. When I went in and searched
around, I was amazed at the variety of subjects that
are covered. Lots of things in there from social
security, agriculture, some inkling into the social
sciences. I think it's a little bit of misnomer of
technical and scientific reports. There are physical
abstracts there, too.

But this is unique content for the FDLP,
having this wide time frame here and it's information
that isn't elsewhere available on the Internet until
Tim's project is finished.

Okay. So we did data testing with 30

depository library volunteers in most of February. We
weren't really testing the system itself because what
we're using is the system that NTIS already had in
place, but they did create a web page interface for
entrance for the depository libraries and that's what
we were testing.

NTIS was very pleased with all the comments
they received from the testers and they are taking the
suggestions and doing this in a phased-in approach. So
we went ahead and created the access for you all and
you may go in there and find that there are some new
features as you go in there from day to day.

They're going to do what they can. Some of
the suggestions may have some technical issues and
maybe not have the capability to do what we're asking,
but I must say that NTIS has been very, very
cooperative and accommodating to the depository
community with this project. It's been a pleasure to
work with them.

Now you can see that. That's our cataloging
record. We did catalog the site and there is a note in
there that it's restricted to depository libraries.

So since February 28th, it's been open to all
depository libraries. You do need to have a validation
form signed by the Director of your library. That's

required before access is granted. There's the URL.

Sorry it's split across lines, but that's the URL for

the form. It's on the FDLP desktop.

As of noon Thursday, we had 245 registered

libraries. We've had a few more since I've been out

here and we also have had one library that we've had to

take out of the program. And we'll get to some of the

reasons why a little bit later.

One of the other things about this pilot

project is that NTIS cannot lose revenue with this

pilot. By law they are self-sustaining, which in

Title 44, takes them out of scope of the depository

library program. So it's very generous of them that

they're working with us in creating access to the

online content.

So we'll be looking at the usage, the

downloads and they'll be tracking financial data and if

it looks like there might be a revenue loss, we may

have to tweak some of the parameters of the pilot in

order for them to be able to meet their legal mandate

of being self-sustaining. But we're really -- we're

really hoping and thinking that that's not going to be

the case.

But when you sign up to have access to DARTS,

there are some obligations. The password and user ID

are to be shared only with those who -- well, that's a

typo. That's supposed to be "provide" and not

"proved." Those who provide reference service and not

with the patrons and this is the reason we had to

deactivate one of the accounts of our libraries. They

were sharing the password and user ID with the broad

community. I got it. So this is really, really

important that you don't share your passwords.

Again, this all goes back to trying to give

us access, but not be -- have any kind of negative

effect on the revenues of NTIS.

DARTS may not be -- you can't go into DARTS

and download something and provide it to an

interlibrary loan request unless that request is coming

from another depository library. So again, you know,

there's some depository libraries that may not sign up

to have access to this service, but they have allowed

us to build in a way that other people in other

libraries in the depository library program can still

have access should they need it.

You're not to download and distribute reports

outside of library users and the FDLP community. This

would be an instance like if you had a particular

subject focus in your regional area -- like in Tim's

case, like the Rocky Flats stuff. If you want to go in

there and search all the Rocky Flats stuff and put up a
web page, that would not be permitted.

You can, however, download a report and make
it available for a course reserve. So that's
temporarily available to your constituencies, but
nothing for long term.

You can have up to 30 simultaneous users and
materials from DARTS can be used for document delivery,
different from interlibrary loan. Document delivery,
of course, is when your patrons are calling your
e-mailing rather than walking into the library, so
you're still serving your primary clientele. So
document delivery is okay.

The depository coordinator is the point of
contact for the project. That's the name of record
with NTIS. And I want to also point out that while you
can't share your password with library users, you may
certainly share it with branch librarians, reference
librarians, if they're in a different unit. They are
providing service.

NTIS from the very beginning was aware that
there might be situations where people would go to
engineering branch libraries, science libraries, as
opposed to the main library and the main reference
desk. So that's also one of the reasons why the 30

simultaneous users is there. We were looking at STAT

USA as a model and of course, they have two

workstations, so we're starting out with 30 here and

see how that goes.

Since this has started, I've had lots and

lots and lots of e-mails with questions and by far the

most frequently asked question is: Is IP authorization

available? And it's not.

That's not to say that it might not be one

day.

The next question is: Can we use a proxy

server for authorization of primary clientele? And the

answer to this is now yes. At the beginning of the

pilot, we were asking that people come into the library

to use the system. I've been talking with NTIS folks

and again, this shows how they've been flexible and

accommodating to the libraries and you can now have

authorization through a proxy server, as long as it's

blocked to the primary clientele. Public still have to

come into the library.

I get the question: How are we to insure

there are only 30 simultaneous users? And -- we just

hope.

Here's the question: Can I make reports from

DARTS available through interlibrary loan? And again,

only if it's another depository library that's
requesting it.

And a question about how we determine the
coverage of the documents in the program and getting
historical data, unique data, online data, and again,
the more recent data would not be available because of
the potential revenue losses.

I do want to mention a Summer Special. And
this is something that NTIS is thinking about doing and
I'm supposed to send up a trial balloon today. So here
it goes.

Is this something that you all would be
interested in? Reports added to the NTIS collection
between 1999 and 2006 on CD ROM, a dollar per title?
You can go in and create a subject, profile and get all
the reports in that profile. And reports return to
their regular price at the first of September. So I'm
calling this the "Summer Special."

So depository libraries, they're giving a
really good price break to you all to fill in gaps in
your collection, get additional copies if there's
something of particular interest. And on the back
table there is a CD ROM that is a sample of the catalog
that you can choose from that's on their website and
what you would receive if you chose to do this and

there's also a flyer about this.

This is not the flyer that's particular to the FDLP. We would do another flyer that gave these parameters here. So the trial balloon is up there.

Is this something that you all think that we need to pursue or would you all be interested in getting the more frequent -- or the more recent NTIS reports?

Yahs?

[No audible response]

Okay. It's a maybe.

Okay. There's my e-mail address if you have questions or comments you want to send to me and I'm turning it over to Ted -- uh-oh, Ann? I can't turn it over yet.

ANN MILLER: Did you say, "Uh-oh?"

CINDY ETKIN: No.

ANN MILLER: I have a couple questions.

Could you go back to the slide that had the URL on it because I can't get it to come up.

Okay. Collection development. Okay. Because I've done a search on the GPO homepage under NTIS and there's nothing showing. So anyway, you might want to know that. There's no link on the collection development page that I could find. So you might want

to make sure the link is on there. Anyway --

CINDY ETKIN: It is, because I checked it
last night and that's the URL.

ANN MILLER: Okay. I've tried it. Let me do
this for a second.

The other question I have is, I've been using
it and as a matter of fact, I used it for a patron the
other week, but when I go in and look at the date
range, it doesn't go back to 1964 on the NTIS page. It
only says '87.

CINDY ETKIN: Are you going in through the
FDLP website? The web interface that they created for
us?

ANN MILLER: Yeah. Logged in and everything.

So I know -- because I was actually looking
at that, trying to figure that out.

CINDY ETKIN: Okay.

ANN MILLER: Because some of those early ones
are the kind of things that -- it may be me. You know,
obviously, I can't seem to find that either, so --

CINDY ETKIN: So you can just find 1987
forward?

ANN MILLER: Well, when you look at the fact,
because I was trying to find the range that was -- the
date range that was covered so I went into the

Frequently Asked Questions and that's what it said. I would have remembered the '60s, I think.

CINDY ETKIN: Okay.

ANN MILLER: So I don't know. I'm happy to be contradicted.

TIM BYRNE: Well, I've done a lot. This is Tim Byrne. I've done a lot of playing with it and the earliest date I found is 1912. So the defense department has put in a lot of older things.

ANN MILLER: There it is.

TED PRIEBE: Oh, I'm sorry. Was there a question on the NTIS pilot?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Yeah. Marcia Meister [phonetic], University of California, Davis.

You mentioned the coverage exclusions really quickly and I wonder if you could just say it again and maybe say a little bit more. I think there's a lot of misunderstanding about that because I know even many people in my institution believe that this is the entire body of NTIS reports and oh, boy, we can, you know, cancel our databases and stuff.

CINDY ETKIN: No. It's not the entire body. It goes from '64 to 2000 and only those titles that have online equivalencies.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: So what -- can you say

again what they're deliberately excluding due to cost
cutting, you know, price -- revenue issues?

     CINDY ETKIN: I'm sorry, Marcia. I can't
hear you.

     AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Could you say again what
they are deliberately excluding due to the revenue
issues?

     CINDY ETKIN: The mirror materials.

     AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Okay.

     CINDY ETKIN: Everything after the 2000.

     AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Okay.
So -- but for the older materials, anything in
particular that we will never find in there?

     CINDY ETKIN: It's just what they've had --
they have online versions for and this is going to be
growing because as they get orders and they digitize
materials, they'll be adding to this database. So
ultimately there will be more, but I don't know exactly
which ones they've digitized and which they haven't.

     I know that the DOE, NASA, DETICK [phonetic]
are in there and we had originally talked about not
included them, but they are in there and lots of social
security stuff, Fish and Wildlife, I've been searching.
I don't know exactly the parameters, but fairly good
coverage.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Okay. Thanks.

TED PRIEBE: Okay. Moving forward, this is Ted Priebe. I am doing today's digitization portion for GPO on behalf of Robin Haun-Mohamed, who wasn't able to join us today. And I will be working with Mark Sandler, who will cover the second half on questions and general discussions.

I did breeze through the first set of slides that I have and I want to reaffirm that what we have and what we're going over today is really a synopsis of that briefing paper so there's nothing that I jumped over in the interest of time. Not wanting this half day session to run long, I'm just going to move fairly quickly through a couple of slides, jump right into the assumptions to get some validation from council and then we'll move into the question.

But I did want to touch on the point that initially for GPO, we had a few meetings of experts. One was on digital preservation masters; subsequently followed up on presentation metadata. We did a survey of the community and that was what drove us to the priority digitization list, and I was actually personally involved in various iterations of the digitization specifications.

All of those things that I'm referencing are

available from the GPO and I've got the access link at the bottom here. The slide deck will be posted on the FDLP desktop as well.

Specific to the digital demonstration project that we had in July -- starting in July of 2006 -- sorry, jumped a little bit too quickly. I did want to reaffirm what the focus was of that digital demonstration project and it was really -- the focus was not on through put. It rather was on validation of the preservation specifications that we had created through multiple internal and external focus group reviews. It was a six-month demonstration. It was approved by our Joint Committee on Printing, and was completed in December of 2006.

The demonstration project, we had a group that came to GPO in January of 2007 and that meeting of representatives was a various group from the federal government, academic libraries and others in the information community. That section's goal again was to review and provide feedback on the converted content that was produced by digital conversion services which is a group in GPO that actually performed the scanning.

The consensus from that group was a validation of those digitization specifications for preservation level scanning and the consensus was they

were acceptable with a few comments. I will give just
a brief bit of background on what was digitized, what
was the scope of that demonstration project and it was
a variety of material starting with some color
publications and that was really to validate the
fidelity and quality of color images and then the
remaining documents that were digitized reflected on
our prioritization lists that we had reaffirmed with
the community.

A couple of examples there: Public laws,
U.S. Code, bound Congressional Record, Federal
Register, and hearings. So those are some of the
things that we reviewed with that group.

For the demonstration projects, we did have
some suggestions that were put forth by the reviewers.
Some of the just briefly -- some of the things we're
including additional elements, focusing on a special
role or niche for digitization as it relates to federal
publications. This is something that -- some of the
issues that were raised -- one of the things that a few
of the people had mentioned is that they wanted to have
a visual comparison of the documents and they wanted to
be able to view those from the desktops versus the
projector presentation that we had, along with the
originals being there. And then also the scope of the

material for GPO to scan.

"What should we be focusing on?" That was
one of the questions that came forward and where we'll
get to with questions to council and also on the
metadata schema which I think Mark -- excuse me,
Richard had asked about earlier and in our digitization
specifications that are posted on that web link, it
does reference the specific metadata elements that we
would be capturing in that famous term of the brief
bibliographic record.

So I apologize for jumping through these, but
I want to make sure we have enough time with council to
get to some of the key discussion points.

Other efforts that GPO and Library Services
specifically are doing are continued coordination and
development of partnerships. Ric on his initial
kickoff talked about some of the partnerships that we
have already implemented and we are working on several
others. GWLA would be an excellent opportunity,
certainly for GPO and Tim and his team have done such
good work.

But the discussion points with some of the
key players in the federal government, such as the
Library of Congress, NARA, and other federal depository
libraries. We are working with them. Specifically we

have a cross-functional multi-federal-agency team known
as the "National Digitization Standard Strategy
Advisory Board" and that's on digitization standards.

We've been with that working group and
there's been several meetings that Robin and some of
her staff have participated in. Those group objectives
are really for a common federal digitization standards
for still images that are comprehensive and objectives
based.

So what we've done is taken our work,
presented that with the group. Some of the purpose and
goals there are to provide the consistency of basically
a unified federal digitization specification.
Ultimately that's a goal and something that would
enable all public and other federal agency users to use
as a common theme as we move forward in the
digitization. So the first task of that group, to
summarize, are really to identify and prioritize those
core standards that will be addressed.

Current status for GPO: I will reaffirm that
we are awaiting final direction from JCP, as Ric and
Mr. Turri, I believe, both may have discussed. That
oversight group will be forming hopefully this week.
I'm not sure at what point we can get direct engagement
on digitization, but as it's queued up, and based on

their availability, we will be moving forward on that

to really try to gain their direct input on GPO's role

for digitization of legacy docs, as we move forward.

So we have been preparing the report for

them. We are reviewing and refining the specifications

that we have based on the demonstration project,

particularly access derivatives, what's required, and

how to validate the best format for our community.

Again, we're just awaiting that final direction from

JCP. So as I jump into these assumptions, I don't mean

to use a caveat, but it really is to validate that we

have some assumptions we want to put forward, but that

is pending. Of course, our oversight is a final

direction based on some of our reporting.

So jumping into the assumptions for council,

Number One: Our assumption is that digitization is an

acceptable reformatting method for preservation and

access to a range of materials, including publications

of the federal government.

Agreement? Okay.

Number Two: GPO coordinate digitization

efforts with library and other partners to establish

priorities, reduce duplication of effort, and ensure

the use of broadly acceptable digitization standards.

Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. Evelyn?

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: In that statement -- at the end of that statement, could we add to standards and best practices? Because really when we talk about digitization for preservation, we're mostly talking about best -- accepted best practices.

TED PRIEBE: Okay. Very good.

Tim?

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne.

I just want to say that with the GWLA project having the GPO specifications, that's something that we could just hand to our vendors and say, "This is what we want," was really, really helpful.

TED PRIEBE: Thank you.

Okay. Number Three on the assumptions: GPO will employ preservation level standards and best practices to ensure authenticity integrity of this information.

Number Four: I have become famous on the last set of assumptions and questions to really ramble on and I apologize for that, but the high level of this is GPO will really be looking to set up relationships and by relationships, I'm really referring to mutually beneficial relationships between GPO and other participants. Those other participants are going to be federal depository libraries, federal agencies,

potentially private organizations, and the whole

purpose of that overarching is really just the

digitization of the legacy collection. So --

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Can I ask a question?

TED PRIEBE: Certainly.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: On the last assumption,

you talk -- oh, I'm sorry. Katrina Stierholz.

TED PRIEBE: Number Three? Okay.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: On this assumption, you

talk about preservation level standards and then talk

about partners and this says, "GPO will employ

preservation level standards." And I'm wondering, have

you considered having -- I'm nervous about saying this

in front of Evelyn, access standards for some documents

where for a variety of reasons access -- having a

digitized copy for access may be good enough for now

and then a separate preservation standard.

I knew you'd kill me. Go ahead.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: This is Evelyn.

Actually Mark and I were talking about this

offline the other day that there is a role for that

type of activity. I certainly am more comfortable if

that role includes a tangible product behind it.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Oh, absolutely.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: But even in traditional

preservation efforts, there are various levels of
decision making that include the value of a specific
publication, object, whatever it is that you are
talking about, and some of those publications or
objects are deemed to have value for the information
contained in them rather than their value as an
artifact and so they're going to receive a different
level of preservation attention.

So for materials that have intellectual
value; that is, value for the content, primarily are
only -- can be reformatted and the tangible can be let
go. That's been sort of a traditional practice.
Microfilming is the -- you know, the classic example of
that. So you're not going to get the kind of
resistance you expected. There is a role for that for
what you're saying.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Well, I think it -- I
think it opens the door for a lot more partners to
participate and have a larger community and then
ultimately a larger body of material digitized faster.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: And there have -- this is
Evelyn again.

There have been discussions over a period of
years and GPO has been included in those discussions
about the ability to have people participate at a level

that they can and when they are able to sort of do
better that they do that, or that there is -- I don't
want to call it a rolling level of acceptable practice,
but I think that's essentially what we're talking
about.

TED PRIEBE: Katrina, this is Ted Priebe,
GPO.

Your point is well taken and actually I've
got that a little farther back in questions for council
to validate just that type of issue of starting out
with an access level and then do we later go after the
preservation level as it's warranted to be inclusive?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Sorry. I didn't read
ahead.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: This is Evelyn again.

I think part of those discussions that also
need to include the cost and just the general concept
of duplication of effort and what that all means.

I had a sort of slightly different question
about Number Four because as I read that assumption,
it's implying that this mere free partnership includes
the partners assuming sort of minimal costs and that
cost does not include the digitization? Am I
interpreting that correctly or understanding that
correctly?

TED PRIEBE: In terms of the near free --
free will?

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Yeah. Well, what is
the -- in terms of this assumption, what are the
partners picking up in terms of cost?

TED PRIEBE: Well, if we -- and this is Ted
Priebe.

For the near free aspect in this discussion,
we would be looking at a partner who is willing to
potentially digitize those legacy documents and may
even -- if their budget would allow, pay for the cost
of postage and handling. That doesn't mean that that
is the only way that GPO would engage on a partnership,
but in the scope of that term that's one, I guess, an
optical scenario, if somebody would be willing to do
that.

They may have the documents and in that case
it may be nothing more than digitization and --

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: On their site?

TED PRIEBE: Yeah.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Okay.

TED PRIEBE: Yeah.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: But if they can't -- if
they don't -- are you saying -- this is Evelyn again.
Sorry.

Are you saying then that if they don't have the ability to digitize on site, they would pick up the cost for sending it to GPO and GPO would digitize it or they would send it to a different partner who has the ability to digitize?

TED PRIEBE: I see Ric Davis.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis from GPO. I was hoping you would take that for me.

TED PRIEBE: Oh, I'm sorry.

[Laughter]

RIC DAVIS: No. We wanted to put this validation out there and, you know, in some ways it's premature and other ways it's not premature and we didn't want to wait on it. If you look back at the strategic vision document that was prepared by GPO, it stated back then that one of the goals was that we would digitize this complete legacy collection and that I think it was sort of implied that GPO would do it all.

One of the things that came out of the meeting of experts that we had at GPO that involved the Federal Depository Library Community and others is that GPO should seriously consider the role of partners in this process because it may be more cost efficient. It may avoid duplication of effort. In thinking about

that, though, there is still this critical role for GPO in terms of making sure their standards are met for both access and preservation level going forward.

So that's really where we are at this point. We need to scope what that term, "near free," and there may be a better word such as relationship and what that means to GPO and I say in some ways it's premature because as Ted mentioned, we need validation from our oversight committee on the Joint Committee on Printing on what role they want GPO to pursue. But this is the type of feedback that we're going to be providing based on what we've heard from the community.

TED PRIEBE: Richard?

RICHARD AKEROYD: This is Richard Akeroyd at the New Mexico State Library.

In other conversations over the past couple of years, I have made a recommendation to GPO and most recently when the council was meeting with its recommendations document, we had at one point in our discussion included encouraging GPO to look at the CONCER model that LC has developed for chart cataloging input on serials records across the country and a lot of major universities participate in that. They are somewhat certified cataloguers who are able to do that.

It dropped out of our recommendations, but I

think there's some implications in there that GPO, when they're talking about things like this, look at models like that that have already been developed and adopt them because otherwise, there's a lot of reinvention of the wheel, I think. And CONCER does assure a certain level of high quality cataloguing, subject access, and other kinds of things that I think are critically important as we consider these kinds of activities.

TED PRIEBE: Thank you, Richard. This Ted.

Point well taken. I mean, the scope of lessons learned and avoiding taking a bad path is clearly in agreement.

Moving forward on the assumptions, this kind of gets to some of the discussion we had earlier, but all converted content for the legacy collection will ultimately be digitized at preservation level specifications.

The goal and assumption -- comments?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina.

I mean, yeah. Some day, 100 years from now. Yeah, I think that would be all I'd say. 100 years from now. I think focusing on access would be a more useful thing for our users.

TED PRIEBE: Okay. Moving forward, access level: Converted content may be included until

preservation level copies are created and that seems like we've covered that one.

Does that respond to your concerns?

Okay.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: No comment.

TED PRIEBE: Okay. And Number Seven: As legacy documents are digitized, access copies will be made available in a variety of formats to facilitate search and retrieval. This kind of speaks to the FDSYS model of enhanced access and availability in various formats.

And with that, we move forward to the questions for discussion. I'll turn it over to Mark Sandler.

MARK SANDLER: Thank you, Ted and thanks to Tim and Cindy also for setting up this discussion so well.

So sort of like Peter Young, I have a joke.

[Laughter]

Do you want to fit it in now or --

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: We want to hear it now.

MARK SANDLER: -- do you want to --

AUDIENCE SPEAKERS: Yeah, now.

MARK SANDLER: You want to go now?

AUDIENCE SPEAKERS: Yeah.

MARK SANDLER: Okay. Well, I'll try to do
this pretty fast.

So a group of women go out on a small boat
for an afternoon sail. You know, a three-hour tour,
like the song says. And after about an hour, a storm
comes up and they lose navigational capability, start
to drift aimlessly. It gets dark. It gets cold, you
know. They're wet and they're hungry and they're tired
and eventually the first woman -- the one woman says,
"You know, I just can't take this any more and I'm a
bank teller. I've been replaced by ATM machine anyway.
I have no future." Throws herself overboard; eaten by
sharks.

An hour later, second person shivering, cold,
suffering, says, "Well, I'm a travel agent. And you
know, all this information is online anyway. No one
respects my expertise. They can get discounts going
direct. I have no future." Throws herself overboard;
eaten by sharks.

Third woman, two hours later says, "Ah, it's
horrible, suffering. I'm a sex worker. People are --
you know, they're content with virtual sex from the
comfort of their homes. No one comes out any more. I
have no future. Don't know what it's going to be. Why
should I struggle like this?" Throws herself

overboard; eaten by sharks.

Fourth woman, she's like busily working on her PDA, documents librarian.

[Laughter]

Trying to download these NOAH Navigational Charts from her WAYS platform computer.

[Laughter]

Ultimately gets the information she needs, you know, steers the boat right back to shore, steps out on the dock, walks to her car, you know, drives to work, just makes it on time for this administrative meeting; eaten by sharks.

[Laughter and applause]

And if you're wondering why that's not funny, well, firstly I wrote it and secondly it's apocryphal and apocryphal humor, never funny.

Let's work our way through these questions. This is actually a very interesting -- and we've had an interesting set up and these questions are interesting, as well.

Lots and lots of digitization going on in the world at all levels. The agencies are doing digitization. GPO is doing digitization. As you've heard this morning, you know, consortia coming together to do this. Individual institutions, North Texas, many

others are doing digitization. The question I guess
we're trying to grapple is what's the appropriate role
for GPO to pursue in this area? What kinds of work
should they be doing hands on and how much time and
attention should they be giving to coordinating efforts
that are happening outside of GPO itself?

And I guess I'll turn first to council is our
tradition, but I think we're really looking for lots of
input from the group -- the group sitting there so
quietly as well.

Council?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells,
University of Missouri.

This is actually an answer, but I think that
if GPO has a role it is to -- in doing its own
digitization is to look at titles that are not likely
to be digitized by all these other partners. Now I'm
not sure what -- how we determine that. And then, of
course, we'd want to make sure that we also prioritize
that list, but I don't think that GPO necessarily has a
place going after what everyone else is likely to do.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: This is Evelyn Frangakis.

I think we covered some of this discussion in
council's recommendations where we clearly indicated
that we believe GPO has a role -- a coordinating role

in the digitization efforts and should focus its own in-house digitization efforts on those priority -- Congressional priority projects, as Geoff just said, those other difficult projects that other people are not able to do.

So I wanted to tie back to the recommendations that council made. So obviously this was done -- this document that we're looking at now was produced before council's recommendations and I want to pull the two together.

MARK SANDLER: I think we have input from the floor?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Beth Harper, University of Wisconsin at Madison.

I definitely agree. It should be -- the focus should be on the difficulty documents. The train has left the station. There are a lot of digitization projects going on. UW Madison is involved in one. I think it's going to be more for access. The other area I would see is for emphasis. What we're doing is taking our copies, working with Google to have them digitized. They're not going to be official copies and for those libraries that need the official copies still, that's -- those documents where people need an official, authentic copy with more backing than just

UW Madison can save, those are the kinds of things.

I'm thinking about legal documents, really. The public laws and so on where I have libraries that want to get rid of things now and they were counting on GPO to digitize these things so they can get rid of them. And the selection certainly can get rid of things, but there are things that they want to hold on to because people need the authentic, official copies. So that would be aside from the difficult, the mass, the smaller items, perhaps shorter items, the illustrations. Those would -- the things where people want official -- either electronic -- want that GPO backing, that would be what I would recommend.

MARK SANDLER: Okay. Thank you.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Mary Alice Baish [phonetic] and the Association of Law Libraries.

Spoken like a real law librarian.

BETH HARPER: Thank you.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: For official, authentic.

Ted, I just wanted -- I know in your part -- your list of partners who's spoken about the NARA and the Library of Congress, I hope you also have made connections with people at the Law Library of Congress. They've been involved in a partnership project with Google and they've digitized the entire legacy

collection of hearings, among other things, and we certainly don't want GPO expending your limited resources for legacy digitization when the Law Library has already done that, and will be making them freely and publicly accessible.

Thank you.

TED PRIEBE: Thank you. Ted Priebe, GPO.

Absolutely. We are under no -- no way, shape or form do we want to exclude anybody who could be a potential partner to help us on this endeavor. I think one of the lessons learned, we've got coming back to Washington will be better outreach in communications so that we can find out these things from the community in a proactive versus reactive manner. So very good.

Yes? Barbie?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

And it seems like also one possible role for GPO might be to -- I don't know, authenticate preservation level copies that are done not at GPO so that, you know, we would do something at a level that was to your standard and then there might be, you know, an authentication process at GPO for that.

I guess, I mean, one other thing I just -- its just more of an observation. I always thought

Bruce's digitization push for GPO was partly to make
sure that GPO had work to do and if there's, you know,
passport sort of mail and you know, all of that, so it
may be that there is less pressure there potentially,
as well.

MARK SANDLER: Ric, you're going to attempt
it?

RIC DAVIS: I'll be happy to. Ric Davis from
GPO.

Bruce mentioned this internally to us many
times, but I don't know if it was really publicly
stated that when he wrote the strategic vision, he said
that he was creating music and it was our job to write
the words to it and that's kind of what we're doing
today. I think at the time that that vision document
was written, it was estimated that there may have been
potentially 500 or more GPO staff who could be moved
over to a digitization effort who may have been
underemployed or underutilized in other capacities.

Since that time I think we've found that that
500 number is really in the range of 20 to 50. And
those staff are now engaged in many activities,
including passports and other parts of our services.
So that's why I think it's very critical as we go
forward, given that we're looking at that size of an

operation at GPO that we look at what our proper role
is and as you mentioned, particularly in regard to
looking at the authentication role for those
preservation masters, which I consider very much an
inherently governmental activity, regardless of what
our partnership activities are.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth,
University of South Carolina.

I have a question: What information is done
at GPO with the registry of digital projects? Is that
looked at as to give an idea of what's being done in
the community? Can a report possibly be taken from
that to give maybe the future council and the community
a sense of what's being done out there by those,
vis-a-vis what would best be done in-house?

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing
Office.

I think the thing that we would really like
to see and it's something that I think we're going to
have to proactively do through outreach is seek to
expand that registry. I think that registry is a
wonderful idea. What I'm finding and Ted can jump in
here and tell me if I'm wrong, but I'm finding that
it's not expanding as much as we had hoped it would in
terms of people adding information to the list to make

sure that we're not duplicating effort and I think we need to -- we need to be a bit more proactive on our part at GPO, as well, to make sure that people know about that list and to reach out on it.

MARK SANDLER: Katrina?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina.

Actually that registry is broken, doesn't work, and means that it's not clear when it's going to be fixed. She probably didn't say it so negatively.

It is very hard to update. I think it would be a good idea to incorporate that registry with all the other things you guys are doing, you know, in that single list we've talked about and then as both expertise and as partnerships and digital projects, you could include that registry and link it up, I think. And that would make some sense.

You kind of have a -- you know, if you can link that database up to what your experts are, that would make sense. But right now, it's a really clunky tool. We add to it or when we try to change things, it's really painful.

MARK SANDLER: Okay.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: So I think it's one of those things that is a good idea, but there's probably enough barriers to use that it hasn't been well used.

MARK SANDLER: If I can steal the last word
on Question Number One before we move on to Number Two,
I'll say this is a very active discussion about the
value of registries and the place of registries in the
sort of larger digital library community now. As our
libraries become more and more online libraries, we
are -- it's starting to look like, you know, "Well, why
don't you just enter your catalog, you know, in a
separate list somewhere?"

It's -- we are actually becoming overwhelmed
with so much content on so many projects that it's very
difficult to assume that people can either keep up with
maintaining those and keeping them current or that
that's the best access strategy.

So I think that maybe one of those things
where, you know, time -- a year or two years makes a
tremendous difference in our assumptions about the
value of those kinds of efforts.

ANN MILLER: May I just follow up? Can you
talk a little bit about what they're discussing in
terms of alternatives, or whether they're just saying,
"We don't really need them at all."

MARK SANDLER: Right.

ANN MILLER: Because a lot of these large
digitization projects don't necessarily have, you know,

cataloging records in OCLC where you can go in and
identify them that way.

MARK SANDLER: Well, that was, I think, going
to be the alternative that I think that folks are
looking to now is, "Wouldn't we be better off entering
digital manifestations of work in OCLC so that it looks
like, you know, part and parcel of our overall catalogs
as a sort of go-to place?"

But I think you're absolutely right. There
are a wide array of projects out there, special
collections and otherwise, where those records aren't
in place and there's still probably room for a
registry. So it's just one of those things that's
being very actively talked about beyond the documents
community, but I think, you know, the kinds of
conclusions you all reach would be of interest as well.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: But I certainly wouldn't
want to dismiss the importance of a registry, if you're
looking for partners, particularly in working with the
legacy, getting the legacy documents up there and I
think it would be fixed. It should be better and it
should be something that certain libraries can look at
when their administrations all of a sudden say, "We're
at that point that we're capable of doing something."
And that they can pick something that's unique and

helpful.

MARK SANDLER: Okay. I made a huge mistake by getting the last word there, but Geoff, why don't you jump in?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay. Very quickly on the registry point. On the library -- is it federation, foundation? I don't speak --

MARK SANDLER: Library Federation.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: -- has standards for recording digital projects is OCLC. Then the ability to get those out easily is also an issue.

But I did want to pick up on something that Barbie mentioned, at least I think that's what she was talking about and that's we were told early on that authentication and authentic digital copies were really the purview of GPO and could only be done through GPO. And I've always felt that, in fact, we can come up with processes to authenticate documents that are digitized in the community and I think we should really start to have that conversation about what that looks like because we receive these. They're on our shelves. They have our stamps. They're official receipts through the program, so I think we need to explore that.

MARK SANDLER: We're going to move on to

Number Two and while sometimes these questions look
boring, I can tell you there was just a great flare up
around this question at the -- one of the focus groups
that Ted mentioned that was held at GPO and it
questions what is the appropriate look for preservation
of legacy digitized documents?

And really the underlying question here is
are we trying to capture the materiality that -- you
know, the actual sort of book object as it looks today
in 2007, or are we trying to capture the publisher's
intent at the point at which it was published, as
opposed to what the actual volume sitting on the
library shelf looks like.

And I'll turn it to council for thoughts on
that?

MR. SPEAKER: I want to hear what was said.

MARK SANDLER: Well, there's a question
about -- that I recall and you know, it's a matter of
if you use a gray scale capture, you can get for older
materials on yellowed paper, you would get very little
contrast between the print and the paper, which is more
or less what the book looks like on the shelf: faded
ink on yellowed paper.

Now there is the option to capture that in a
bi-tonal way to really sort of brighten the print and

make it easier to read, but the question is, are you

losing this sort of historical significance of that

yellowing paper? And that was the -- and then the

discussion deteriorated from there about boxing and

would we have to do this -- you know, in 50 years would

we have to do this over as the paper becomes browner

still?

[Laughter]

Would we want to go back and say now, in

2050, this is what it looks like?

So that was the nature of the discussion.

Richard?

RICHARD AKEROYD: Richard Akeroyd, New Mexico

State Library.

I'm going to preface this by saying I'm an ex-

special collections librarian. I started my career

cataloging rare books.

I think today what we need is the best

possible accessibility, both in terms of subject

access, but then when somebody gets this thing, let's

make sure they can get the information they're looking

for. I think there's other means to preserve the look

and feel of a historic and a rare document and that's

what I would opt for.

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill.

I think the important point, given the fact that we've seen floods, fires, all kinds of other disasters happen that just totally wipes out the content, as well as the character, you need to capture the content.

MARK SANDLER: Evelyn? We're waiting for the shoe to drop.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Given the scenario that Pete just presented, I would agree. I think that perhaps some -- I'll call them "subject experts" might want to weigh in, in the historical context to see if, in fact, there are any GPO material that might fit into a category of art factual value. Because for these historical documents to preserve that look and feel, if you're going to scan at a level where you can see the yellow or the grain of the paper or whatever --

MARK SANDER: Boxing was talked about, for instance.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Then I think it's a subject experts here that would really need to weigh in about the value of doing that for certain historical publications, rather than the preservation folks.

MARK SANDLER: Okay. I'm going to move fast to Three, because I think we have about six minutes left.

The question is: Are there particular format issues you need to government publications where different methods of capture or representation are appropriate. And you know, we're thinking about fun sizes. We're thinking about tables. We're thinking about maps. We're thinking about, you know, is this content as a body different than the kinds of things that generalists are talking about when they're talking about digitizing large bodies of text?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, University of Missouri.

I actually think the answer is: "No."

If you look at the wealth of material out there, you will find similar things all over the place. I really think so, so --

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: This is Evelyn Frangakis.

I think if you -- this question could potentially argue for higher quality. There may be areas here where an access copy is not good enough, depending on the -- maybe the font size of the material or the particular type of data that's contained in it, in terms of an access level quality captured just might not cut it for the user.

So this question definitely could argue for higher quality standards for digitization.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina.

I think I would say yes, but I'm not sure
that it's GPO's role to do it. I could see for numeric
things that having the tables entered and OCR'd and
corrected would be fabulous. I don't think that's
GPO's responsibility though, or even the partner's
responsibility. I mean, if people want to value add,
that's fantastic, but I think if you set that as the
standard, whew, that's too much.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Could you expand on the
value add? I mean, we weren't readable, right? So if
you can't read what's in those tables, how is that a
value add?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: And I expect -- no, I
expect readable. What I don't expect is that the
tables are essentially reformatted into text -- into
actual numeric data that could be entered into an EXCEL
spreadsheet or, you know, whatever. That's a value add
that would be fantastic for the user. But I don't
think it's GPO's responsibility to do that. I think
that's where either other institutions or commercial
vendors come into play, just like they do now for other
value add things.

MARK SANDLER: Okay, Steve?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: A brief comment. Steve

Hayes, Notre Dame.

I think you want to be careful with that because we have had for years that microfiche, you know, best available copy and yeah, it's there and yeah, there's an image. No, you can't read or use anything on it.

So I think you -- in viewing that, you do look to the marketplace. Many places are, you know, if you want that, they will produce the table that can be downloaded into whatever, but the big thing is, you have a minimum that, you know, I can read it. I can rekey it. I can do whatever it is.

Not just, "Oh, look. Here's an image and oh, there's the fuzzy table that, you know, if I go and get the original, I can now use the content."

So we have experience. We have a lot of microfiche in our collection that are there, et cetera.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Steve, I'm not saying -- this is Katrina.

I'm not saying that it should be readable. I'm just saying that typing it in is not --

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Not functional.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Yeah.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: And that question or that standard, I think, has to be defined pretty carefully

that says, you know -- and again, I go back. We have

plenty of examples of, "We sent you something." It's

totally unusable, so we met our obligation of

distribution. You can't use it.

MARK SANDLER: Okay. I'm going to jump

along. I think we have three minutes left or four

minutes left. And we have a one, two, three, four

questions so -- when access derivatives are available,

should redigitization for preservation be a lower

priority than for content not available in an online

form at all?

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: This is Evelyn.

I have a question. When we're asking about

content derivatives, are we implying then that there is

a preservation book copy behind that access derivative?

MARK SANDLER: A print copy.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Oh, that there is a print

copy behind the access derivatives?

MARK SANDLER: That would be my assumption.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Meaning that it was

originally scanned at an access level?

MARK SANDLER: Yes.

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: Okay.

MARK SANDLER: And then, does it make sense

to say, "Well, we're going to look for those things

that have not been done in some form to make them
electronically accessible, as opposed to giving a
higher priority or primary attention to saying we need
to redo these at a higher level?

EVELYN FRANGAKIS: This is Evelyn again.

For me, there is an issue of authenticity
that comes into play here that I think needs to be
considered in the weighing of those options. You know,
if those access level derivatives are considered
non-authentic objects, despite the level of quality of
the scanning? Then I think that should be weighed in.
That's a concern.

ANN MILLER: This is Ann Miller.

I think this then goes to what Steve was just
saying is that there needs to be an assessment of the
quality of the access scan. So you know, if it's
looking like it's been done, but it's not, you know,
very readable, then perhaps this would give it a higher
priority for going back to looking at it.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth.

And I wouldn't want to set something up that
if a partner said, "I'm willing to go back and do it
better," that that would be discouraging them to go and
do that because they see a new or a new value or new
reason that this should be at a better level.

So I wouldn't want to create that idea that, "Oh, there's access level. Let's go do something else." I'm the one giving these strange looks.

I'm interpreting this as -- I mean, are we supposed to read this as GPO doing stuff or partners and GPO doing stuff?

TED PRIEBE: This is Ted at GPO.

It isn't specific to GPO redigitizing just the concept of some thing is available. It's accessible and searchable, but it is not at a preservation level; therefore, do we make it a very -- a much lower priority than content that is not available in any shape or form electronically?

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Again, I wouldn't want -- if somebody went and scanned a certain access level, the public papers of the President of the United States, and then someone else decided they wanted to turn around and do it at a preservation level, if they thought that was of value to their institution, it would be providing a value to everybody down the road.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: This is Geoff Swindells, University of Missouri.

I actually think the answer to this is, "Yes, unless other considerations warrant moving it into a higher priority." I mean, there's lots of reasons one

might want to do this, including simply local interest.

I mean, this doesn't say that you can't digitize stuff, but I think if we're looking globally at where to put our priorities, I think that unless there are reasons -- and there are plenty of good reasons to bump something up that has an access level copy, but not a preservation level copy, then they should be lower.

MARK SANDLER: Now you all voted for that joke earlier and now you're going to be punished and have to stay here, even though it's break time.

So Number Five, how do GPO's initiatives to do digital conversion fit with other digitization efforts that are already underway and in the community?

And that's this question of, you know, how much do they need to be doing? How much do they need to be coordinating?

ANN MILLER: This is Ann Miller.

That's kind of the question, isn't it? I mean, that's -- how does it fit? Well, you know, seamlessly. It should be cooperative. It should be one with all of the rest of what we're doing -- the rest of us are doing. I think -- I don't quite know how we're supposed to answer this question because the answer is, "Yes. It should fit with other."

How?

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: So it should compliment
other work?

ANN MILLER: Yeah, compliment, integrate
with.

WILLIAMS SUDDUTH: I think the recommendation
that we had yesterday pretty much covers this also.

MARK SANDLER: Let's do at least one more --
I guess we only have one more question. Six, great.

MR. SPEAKER: Last one, last one.

MARK SANDLER: And that is I asked before if
there's anything in the format of the material we're
dealing with that sort of makes digitization of
government information different than other kinds of
projects that we are working on in the community.

What about our users? Is there anything
about our users that we ought to be paying attention
to, this sort of range and diversity of folks that
we're serving. It's not just an academic audience.
It's not just a -- you know, a traditional library
using audience.

Is there anything about our users that would
cause us to approach digitization differently or where
GPO ought to be cognizant of that end user needs?

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Pete Hemphill.

I'll relate to you a personal experience
here. Access for the elderly to information such as
health information and other things need to be made as
simple as possible so that it can be accessed easily
and really by people who may have disabilities, by
people who have -- you know, or may not be familiar
with computers.

My father, who has lymphoma, received a DVD,
went to his local library and said, "I don't know how
to do this. You know, this is critical information to
my life." And the librarian pointed to a DVD player
and said, "It's over there."

My mother, who was in tears, couldn't get
this done. My father was upset because he couldn't get
the information. It needs to be simple. It needs to
be straightforward. It needs to be usable.

MARK SANDLER: Richard?

RICHARD AKEROYD: I'd like to go back to the
previous question, if there are no more here on this
one?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I have one more on this
and I also have one on this.

RICHARD AKEROYD: I think, the way I look at
this is actually -- is in terms of derivative products.
I think that certainly with the preservation copy

behind the scene, then you'd want to provide a variety
of ways of displaying and creating products that that
particular user needs and I'm not sure that this is
about digitization in the first place, but I could be
wrong.

ANN MILLER: This is Ann Miller.

This also goes to what Denise was sort of
mentioning yesterday with looking at the train, the
trainer model, and making sure that this content can be
delivered over to users in libraries that don't
necessarily have high bandwidth, who have a variety of
browser incarnations and versions. You know, that of
course the panoply of the abilities of users to access
the information, but I think my primary contribution,
because I'm certainly not going to try and refute one
of you.

MARK SANDLER: Thanks. It's five -- I'm
sorry, Ann.

ANN MILLER: Go ahead.

MARK SANDLER: It's five after, so I'm going
to take Barbie then I'm going to let Richard circle
back to one question then we're going to go have a
break.

Barbie?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I'll just jump on Mary

Alice's horse. I mean, the official stuff has to be
represented in that authentic official way, with a
stamp on it.

      MARK SANDLER: Thank you, Barbie.

      And Richard, you wanted to circle back to?

      RICHARD AKEROYD: This is Richard Akeroyd,
New Mexico State Library.

      I want to look at that last -- the second
question in this two-part question. I, among others, I
don't know how many here in a week will be at -- in
Washington for National Library Legislative Day, and in
a variety of forums preparing for that, I hear about
everybody's need -- I mean, everybody's budget requests
and they're asking us as we go to the Hill to talk to
our representatives to advocate for their budget,
Library of Congress, NARA, et cetera, et cetera.

      Who has the convening authority to bring
those agencies together to deal with this kind of a
question so that there isn't -- obviously you can
identify what's going on and not overlap and duplicate
what other federal agencies are doing. That convening
authority should be pretty powerful and it should go a
long way to answering some of this question and in the
context of those budget reductions, we all know that
none of these agencies are going to be getting their

full budget requests.

This kind of thing can help to mitigate the fact that they aren't going to be getting their full budget request. So I really would urge somebody to assume that convening authority, if it isn't already there, and follow up on this kind of thing.

MARK SANDLER: To my horror, Denise wants to say something and then that will actually be it.

[Laughter]

DENISE DAVIS: You know, it might be endless.

MARK SANDLER: Oh, that was brief. Thank you, Denise.

Thank you very much, Tim, Cindy and Ted for doing good set up on this and as always, we appreciate your comments in the discussion. Thank you.

[Applause]

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: And we'll convene back at 10:30.

[Off the record from 10:09 a.m. to 10:32 a.m.]

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Our last session. I hope that you have found that this has been a good conference. Our last session, but not least, is going to be on assessments. At the end of this, we'll do a little bit of wrap up of the conference.

I'll turn it over to Kathy Brazee and we'll

have a discussion about assessments.

KATHY BRAZEE: Thanks, Bill.

Can you hear me okay?

[No audible response]

Okay. I had hoped to come up with, you know, some big jokes. This is the last session of the conference. I don't have anything at the moment, but I was thinking that when I was an inspector in 2002 and early 2003 that I always took promotion materials to the libraries that I visited and so I was thinking I could bring in some promotion materials and hand them out this session, except we're coming up with new promotion materials, I recently learned. I sit right next to Jim Cameron. He's our promotions person in the sales unit at GPO and he showed me some really cool things. So they're coming. So don't know when exactly, but sooner rather than later.

I'm going to give an over -- an introduction actually and an overview of what we're thinking about right now in terms of public access assessments and I'm going to actually read the general assumptions with the indulgence of council. I'd actually like to read all of them all the way through because they do have some descriptive information in there, as well. We can go back and address each assumption.

That is the first question: Are the
assumptions correct?

And then Denise Davis from ALA here on
council has kindly agreed to facilitate the questions
and answers.

So I am extremely impressed all of you are
here on the last session of conference about this
topic. We at GPO strongly believe in the value of
library visits and assessments of some kind.

When I was a coordinator at a medium sized
academic institution, I got to write a self-study. I
got to be inspected. I actually asked for my library
to be inspected because it really did help the
particular situation at that point in time and I read a
few self-studies and I've inspected a few libraries, as
well, as an inspector.

So to begin, the goal of Depository Library
Assessments, formerly known as "Inspections," is to
ensure that depositories comply with FDLP legal
requirements. GPO has the responsibility to ensure
that the resources it distributes to Federal Depository
Libraries are made accessible to the general public.

Of course, our ultimate customer is the
general public, Even in an assessment, the focus is on
general public access to government information,

obviously through assessment of the depository library conditions.

But I just wanted to say that is the purpose. It always has been the purpose of assessments, just to make sure that that's clear. And I'd also like to admit upfront, of course, there are lots of stories about inspections, but I actually would like to pausit there are some urban legends, as well. I'm going to mention one a little bit later.

For a really good description of inspections, I'd like to reference the 1993 Federal Depository Library Manual. There are some subsequent things. There's a 1995 article by Sheila McGarr[phonetic] as well that you can find in administrative notes.

But I think the 1993 manual article is actually really good. It's one of the chapters in the manual and that's still available on the desktop. And it talks about how the inspection process is a positive process benefitting both GPO and the Depository of Libraries. And it gives you an idea of what the day is like -- a day in the life of a depository library being inspected at that point in time.

So there is authority in law. The Superintendent of Documents shall make first hand investigation of conditions for which need is indicated

and include the results of investigation in his annual
report.

This is dated 1968, I believe, this
particular section.

And Depository Libraries shall make
Government publications available for their free use to
the general public. Not a surprise to anybody, I
believe.

So I'd like to give you some background on
the assessment process over time. Obviously these were
following the current rules and regulations in the FDLP
at that point in time. Individual library conditions
have been evaluated different ways. We started using
defining surveys -- well, defining surveys of
depository library started in 1947, I believe, and we
have always looked at the results of that individual
libraries.

There was an inspection program in early '70s
till 2003 and varying levels of formality during that
time period and in 1996, the self study of the Federal
Depository Library was introduced. If you're not
familiar with it, it's a report based on a template
that's still available on the FDLP desktop that
depository staff filled out and sent on to GPO. GPO
inspectors, depository staff reviewed -- depository

services staff, excuse me, reviewed the reports and if there were any compliance issues, we actually arranged an on-site inspection and that actually happened about 50 percent of the time. That's 5-0 percent of the time.

And of course, there's always been ongoing, formal -- less formal communication visits as staff have been in an area -- phone calls, phone consultations and the like.

A few years ago, about three years ago, I believe, there was an initiative proposed to place GPO representatives as consultants in various regions around the country. The ideas of these consultants would provide assist the original depository coordinators, provide regular training and consultation on depository management so that libraries would remain in compliance, but obviating the need for inspections or at least many inspections and this is an ambitious project.

Obviously there are obvious benefits and advantages to having someone in the geographic region. Add to that it's also expensive, so -- and tell her if this is funded, we have to have a contingency plan so that GPO complies with its regulation to make first-hand investigation of depositories.

I just wanted to give a little bit more background. If you're not familiar with what used to be the inspection process, it might have -- if you're new as a federal depository coordinator, you might have seen the inspection reports at your library and the self study reports at GPO and they're organized in a way that follows the chapters in the instructions at the depository libraries fairly closely.

I'd like to read those chapters to you: Collection Development, Bibliographic Control, Maintenance, Human Resources, Physical Facilities, Public Service, Cooperative Efforts, and if applicable, Regional Services for Regional Depositories.

Now please forget all that and let's think more outside the box. That's just to give you some background and some sense of what could be assessed at libraries, but we're trying to actually focus instead on the public access component of assessments. Given a little bit broader view to the assessment process, focusing more on results of the processes you have at your individual depositories, rather than an ingredient of how the procedures actually work as has been the case from time to time different inspections and it's all context dependent, library dependent, because each library is different. I'm going to touch more on that

in a moment.

My library certainly had what I thought were very unique issues when the inspector came and visited my library. So if there is a concern about public access as a result of whatever we set up as a checklist to review in a public access assessment, we may very well get into learning more about the process, the policies behind the results of all of this. So we certainly may touch on processes at some point in time and if we know the process, certainly we can suggest best practices, alternatives.

There's always so many different ways to achieve that end result of public access and of course, there's particular focus with this on best practices on how to provide public access and we'll certainly be investigating that and certainly welcoming all of your advice and suggestions on all that.

I wanted to mention, too, that inspection and self studies reports certainly the time that I was an inspector, were a combination in some ways of an evaluation of the depository conditions and an education tool. It got to be, in my case, quite lengthy because I wanted to be as helpful as possible and provide a lot of information to the libraries because we didn't have any other major mechanism like

that.

We now have vocal, so we can share depository management training that way so that again, thinking outside the box, we can certainly look at public access assessments in a different way than we had with the inspection program.

So in public access assessments, public access to all formats and depository resources and related services is emphasized. We are continuing to evaluate individual depository conditions. I actually shouldn't say we're continuing to evaluate. We haven't started these and we're in the -- I've got a project planned and we're working with a team of people at GPO and we certainly we've got several former inspectors on tap in different areas, and former depository library coordinators in different areas, and this is going to be a process where you are going to know what's going on during the process and we'll be asking for your feedback and you will know what to expect of a public access assessment.

So along with the evaluation part of it, assessments of depository conditions will continue to offer the opportunity to share the best practices. You might know these as recommendations in the former inspection reports. And this is in order to enhance

depository services and promote greater efficiency and effectiveness of depository operations.

I'm going to talk more about this when I get to the general assumptions. The general assumptions include a little bit more detail, but I wanted to give an overview basically of responsibilities of depositories. If we're thinking outside the box that these public access assessments don't need to be organized the same way as the self-study reports and inspection reports, basically these are the responsibilities we're looking at, at this point in time.

I actually got this information from the preface to instructions to the depository libraries. The instructions, of course, are the current rules and regulations of the FDLP. They will be superseded by the handbook that is coming out, chapter by chapter, for your review. And the handbook is going to also take the place of the Federal Depository Library Manual, which is pretty dated from 1993. And there may be subsequent information that has been posted on the desktop about policy or process. Instructions focus on rules and regulations and the manual is more about process and procedures in those practices.

So, responsibilities of depository access:

Providing for free public access to federal government information products, regardless of format. Collections -- come back to this again in a second. Collections providing for proper selection, bibliographic control and maintenance to promote accessibility and use of the Federal Depository Library materials entrusted to an individual depository.

And service, providing services and professional expertise to meet government information needs of the local community.

Collections is in this list. I'm not advocating it at all that we continue to -- or set up an assessment program that continues to focus on the tangible collections. The instructions to depository libraries certainly have a focus on the tangible collection, but we're not in an environment where we certainly have so much online.

And as the handbook actually contains no new policy, it's a combination of all of our other guidelines and rules and regulations and certainly would be very helpful in one tool, but we're certainly going to be looking at any needed desired updates in policy. So collections certainly covers online collections, as well online selections and it's there because depositories, of course, serve the federal

government information needs of the general public so
the collection development policy is incredibly
important.

Every depository in my mind should start with
their collection development policy. And accessing the
tangible collection is obviously still important in
terms of public access. There is a closed stack
situation and nothing in the closed stacks are in the
automatic retrieval system. It's cataloged, and there
aren't very many good finding tools in the library.
Basically that collection has become invisible and that
becomes a public access issue.

And if a library is transitioning -- wanting
to transition to mostly electronic depository and
they're selecting a lot of online only publications,
but none of them cataloged. There's no web page
showing government information. There's nothing on the
home page showing the FWD graphic. The only way you
would know that this library is depository is if you
ask at their reference desk. That actually leads so
some public access concerns, as well.

And Denise Stevens mention yesterday in the
open forum that want requirements to facilitate service
and public access, as well. I thought that was really
nice comment, so we wanted to make sure that we have

policies so we assessment libraries -- the conditions
at depository libraries appropriately in the current
environment. We cannot assess where there is no
policy. We can certainly make recommendations.

And when I was an inspector, I made a whole
of recommendations. So it's a balance act at this
point in time and certainly the havoc is going to be a
great leap forward in referencing current issues. It
would still need to review some of the policies,
certainly for the electronic environment.

Also, for the record I wanted to mention that
ideals are nice. This is not a prescription for a
perfect situation. We're not at all saying that every
library has to be perfect and meet this really, really
high ideal. Just want to make sure that public access
is provided and there's so many different ways to do
that in depositories.

So the process under consideration is based
on a project plan, a written project summary at this
point. Then there's a whole bunch of activities we
wish to accomplish before we begin systematic
assessment in 2008 some time. Again, this is just a
plan. We're planning a progressive review of
individual library conditions.

We actually did this in the past, but I think

this adds more detail to the -- potentially more
options and detail to the process. So one proposal is
to assess individual conditions at all depositories to
review the bi-annual survey which you submit anyway
because it's required by law and also, we would look at
library web pages. So realize that you don't have to
actually have to do anything there, except fill out the
bi-annual survey, which you have to do anyway.

The next one, by the way, is this fall.

And then if there's any issues -- if further
review is warranted, additional action may include from
consultation. Oftentimes when I did phone calls after
reviewing a self-study report, not only would we be
talking to the depository coordinator, but we'd also be
talking to the library director and library assistants,
working with documents and we'd also bring in regional
depository coordinators so there's no one set way of
doing any of this. It kind of depends, again, on the
situation of the unique situation of the library.

We could also review library policies,
anything that is not online yet on the library web
pages. Libraries can certainly submit those for
review, and perhaps provide examples of how their
actually carried out in the library. I would love to
update the self-study and we have a question about

that. Actually, I'd like your input.

You can find again, the self study on the
desktop. It's definitely out of date. We certainly
need to update the questions and we could reorganize it
in a different way. It currently follows those
chapters in the Instructions to Depository Libraries I
mentioned before. So we could look at reorganizing
that. If a depository wished, it could voluntarily
fill out a self-assessment and submit it to GPO.

And outside of a regular assessment,
libraries could then use this as a self-assessment tool
just on their own, perhaps just do a chapter at a time,
depending upon the their situation -- perhaps share it
with a regional depository librarian. Regionals
potentially could use this self-study tool when they
visit depositories, as kind of a checklist or template.
Perhaps there could be a section for selectives to also
assess their regionals in terms of service so, so many
options there.

And last, but not least, is an onsite
assessment and this is not meant to be last. It's
certainly not least. I think if a depository really
wanted to, they could call it today and we have the new
GPO participation web form out there and a library
could request a onsite assessment at this point in

time. And informally -- less formal than it will be
when these public access assessments become more
systematic. And of course, assessment today would be
based on the instructions to the depository libraries.
We'd certainly have to review the situation.

A lot of times when we get on the phone and
discuss individual library situations, we can come up
with so many options and examples that an onsite visit
may not be necessary, but there's a lot of reasons why
an onsite visit can be very helpful so you can have
someone in the library saying, "Hey, you're doing
fantastic things. Keep doing them. Library Director,
please continue to fund all this."

So there's certain advantages, I think, to
having the onsite visit. Further review could also
include peer review by experts and we define experts.
And something new and there's a question about this.
It could also include -- we could also look at customer
satisfaction surveys or patron satisfaction surveys.
According to the 2005 survey of depository libraries,
17 percent of depository libraries already conduct
patron satisfaction surveys. So they don't know what
kinds of questions each library is asking about
depository services, and certainly along with this we
also need to do more research about other models of

assessment or library network coordination. There's
the -- and I hope I get this right, the National
Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped
Program.

Did I get the name right?

Thank you.

And there's the academic peer review process
and the patent and trademark office has its own
depository library program, which is very different.
It's conveniently smaller than the depository library
program, but I understand they use patron satisfaction
surveys to keep up to date with what's going on in
their libraries. So we definitely want to investigate
that.

So there's no review template yet. There was
an old inspector checklist or template and I'd be happy
to share that if you want to know what that is. It's
extremely out of date, doesn't really address the
online environment and we haven't kept it up to date.

Anyway, one of the activities being planned
is the development of kind of just a cheat sheet for
us, a checklist and we're going to run that against
some results from the 2005 survey submissions to see if
it actually works for us so that we know that we can
accurately and adequately determine that public access

is being provided at individual depositories and the 2007 survey questions have been drafted and are being reviewed and they've been drafted with the idea that they'll be used for public access assessments so that's certainly there and will be available.

And sort of depending upon, of course, as we all know, staffing levels and resource issues, potentially could look at reviewing, say, half the libraries in one bi-annual survey round and maybe the other half in the next bi-annual survey round so a depository would be assessed every four years. Just one option among many.

And getting back to the library web pages, just a personal comment. The reason we definitely want to look at library pages is when I was reviewing the self-study reports and then took a look at library web pages, that's where I saw a significant amount of conflict between the answers on the self-study and the library web pages. So just for your information.

It's helpful to look at the rest of your library web pages every once in a while, especially if you're at a large institution. You may not know that a policy has been posted that may affect depository service.

And the reason that's important is because

the library web pages are the public face and this is

what the general public patrons are going to check and

look at for hours, services, types of collections at

each depository. So it's a real good public place for

the online services and online content.

Now gee, there are a few issues. Number One

is probably -- the first issue here is probably going

to any concerns about public access will be evaluated

as they arise and may include follow-up actions. If

somebody calls us today and says, "I was denied access

to such and such a library," and this happens rarely,

but it does happen. We then call the depository

coordinator and usually it's a real easy solution and

oftentimes the patron is not necessarily planning to

use federal government information resources and the

depository resources, but is using the FDLP as one way

to try and gain access to the library.

So we certainly contact the library in all of

these cases, but also, if there is a concern in a

public access assessment as there were during the

inspection era, we could ask for a three-month

follow-up or a six-month follow-up from a depository

library so that the library then would have an

opportunity to try things out, to try and come into

compliance in certain ways and certain issues. So we'd

want to make sure that follow-up actually does happen.

And the second bullet here, assessments are based on the current rules and regulations for depositories, as well. Our document for that is changing, so obviously we'll keep that in mind. We have to learn everything that's in the new handbook. I used to have this thing memorized in many ways so we're certainly aware. We have to read the new handbook's chapters, too. We know that this is a changing environment.

And the third bullet is just there to let you know that this is outside of the regular assessment process, we'll continue visits to depositories with a focus on consultation and sharing the best practices. So that we can see all different types of libraries and learn from you guys, too. There's a difference between, you know, talking to a library on the phone and actually visiting a library onsite. You see different things. You learn different things. You can talk to more of the library staff, too. So there's advantages certainly to visiting libraries from time to time.

So with council's indulgence, I'd actually like to read all these assumptions and there are the same ones that are in the Review Topic Paper, but they

actually provide a little bit more description.

Public access assessments emphasize how depository libraries serve the general public's federal information needs by reviewing how they provide access to and services for the Federal Depository Resources. Public access includes bibliographic, physical building, tangible collection, internet and onsite computer access. And I'd be interested if you have any more additions to that list.

Next assumption: Assuming my clicker doesn't move too fast here. The public access assessment process will be flexible in reviewing depository conditions. I think the inspection process generally was, too. Every library is different and GPO must continue to assess each situation and context. I think we all know every library is different, but we all have the same goal of providing federal government information to the general public.

Are they not in the same order?

Okay. Is that okay?

I'll make sure to double-check at the end.

Communication and sharing: The best practices between GPO and depository library personnel should work to reduce any confusion about FDLP policies and provide libraries options in the operational ways

they choose to meet their legal requirements. So we
have to continue to explain the rules and regulations
and certainly the handbook is helping us do that. The
handbook chapters were written by volunteer -- probably
several of you out here in the audience and
volunteers -- other volunteers from the community.

Assessments are a review of conditions in
depository libraries according to the current rules and
regulations of the FDLP at the time of assessment.
That's stays the same as it was during the era of
inspections and self studies.

GPO will continue to solicit and gain
feedback from the depository library council and the
depository library community about public access
assessments in order to reinstate a valuable and
effective assessment program for all depositories.

The GPO personnel performing assessments will
be professional librarians with up-to-date knowledge of
depository management best practices.

Assessments should be viewed as a positive
process designed to help libraries meet
responsibilities as federal depository libraries,
but -- there's always a but -- there should be
consequences for failure to provide public access to
federal depository resources. Probationary status may

be an option when public access to depository resources
is denied. And there's actually a section in the law,
Section 1809 of Title 44, which allows for this
probationary status.

Anyone, a member of the general public,
library director, library personnel, original librarian
for example, may request an onsite public access
assessment.

And GPO expects to establish a regular
individual library assessment schedule, but we also may
perform some assessments outside the schedule to
accommodate or address individual library needs.

Did I miss any?

Oh, there's no slide for this, sorry. Missed
one of the general assumptions.

Public access assessment emphasize
qualitative review, rather than quantitative review of
depository conditions. Qualitative review includes
such things as a review of the self-assessment or peer
review of the depository operations, library patron
satisfaction surveys or comments, written library
collection development or bibliographic control or
access policies. And the quantitative review would
include things such as the library added selection rate
or tangible collection size.

So let me just read that again since there no general point to that since there's no slide.

Public access assessments emphasize qualitative review, rather than the quantitative review of depository conditions.

I'm going to speed back to the beginning of the assumptions. Shall we take that first assumption I just read since there's no slide?

And we'll go through the assumptions and then Denise is going to take over with the general questions.

Actually, before we get to the assumptions, I actually did have one joke, I thought.

[Laughter]

This may be more of a joke for me than it is for you. You may groan.

If you go to the instructions to depository libraries and you look at the index, there is index entry for rubber bands on microfiche. I'm not kidding. This is why the inspectors would go to the microfiche cabinets, first of all, we'd would want to know that you actually have microfiche cabinets so that microfiche are available, if they were selected at depository libraries. I don't know. There's some inspector magic that just happens where an inspector

would open a drawer and see the one -- one rubber band
to the entire range of microfiche cabinets. I don't
how that happened, but it's not my intention to open
microfiche doors.

If you -- the depository library has a policy
for care of the collection and the coordinator explains
how they go about using that and see that there's a
microfiche cabinet. What we're interested in is the
fact that there is public access to those microfiche.
Obviously if you've got a preservation plan -- question
made with policy, that's useful, too, but would not
necessarily going to address or continue to follow a
lot of what I think are common urban legends, I guess,
about the inspection program and rubber bands and
microfiches is one of those.

So public access assessments emphasize
qualitative review, rather than quantitative
conditions.

Comments from council?

MARK SANDLER: Kathy, this is Mark Sandler
from the CIC.

I guess I just want to say in one of your
earlier slides, I think you said that the assessment
would be primarily through the bi-annual survey and the
library's web page. You know, here we have a broader

range of access opportunities to focus on the physical
building, as well as the internet and all and I guess I
just wanted to just sort of call attention to the
extent to which all libraries are increasingly judged
by their web presence, as opposed to their onsite
presence and just how important that is to my mind
going forward, that that is the library. That is the
primary access that the public sees and really, I guess
I would weight that very heavily compared with onsite
access.

KATHY BRAZEE: Any comments about the slide
that's currently up? Public access assessments
emphasize how the depository library serve the general
public's information needs? I mean, how they provide
access to end services for?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: This is Geoff Swindells,
University of Missouri.

When we make it back to this later, but I
mean, these are all nice minimums, but they don't tell
me what I want to know about a depository much and that
is, are they having an impact on their clientele?

I realize that from a program point of view,
you have different things that you're responsible for
looking for, but it would be interesting to see how
this can dovetail into local efforts that measures your

public services?

KATHY BRAZEE: How does council wish to work this? Just go through the general assumptions first, like through council and then come back? Okay.

And the public access assessment process will be flexible.

It's the last session of the conference. And I'm really impressed how many people are here, too. Communication and sharing the best practices should reduce any confusion, et cetera.

Council continues to nod in agreement, for the transcript.

[Laughter]

We're documenting this.

Assessments are a review of conditions in depository libraries according to the current rules and regulations.

And GPO will continue in soliciting and gain feedback and obviously we have to share the information.

Another yes?

GPO personnel performing assessments will be professional librarians, with experience or knowledge of management.

Good. Thank you for making this so easy.

We'll see what happens coming up.

Assessment should be viewed as s positive
process, but there should be consequences for failure
to provide public access.

And anyone may request an onsite public
access assessment, including a member of the general
public.

Yes. Oh, I'm really happy.

GPO expects to establish a regular assessment
schedule that we could perform assessments any time,
depending upon the needs and the conditions at an
individual library.

Would you like to address this slide or a
previous one?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: The previous one.

KATHY BRAZEE: A previous one.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I don't know where the
power is on this. Okay.

I wanted to ask: Do you really -- I mean,
anyone can request it, but you're not going to go an
onsite survey ever time you hear from someone?

KATHY BRAZEE: Correct, correct.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Okay.

KATHY BRAZEE: We need to assess the
situation and develop a checklist just for regular

systematic review of each individual depository as
required by law, so certainly any complaints we get
about depository access, we'd call -- contact the
depository library, contact the regional, as
appropriate and we would review the situation in this
case, as well.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

KATHY BRAZEE: And last, but not least, set
up a regular schedule, but we could also perform an
assessment at any time, depending upon the individual
conditions of the libraries.

Yes, okay.

DENISE DAVIS: Thank you very much. Okay.
Now for the question and answer period and I, too, have
a joke.

MARK SANDLER: Is this required now?

DENISE DAVIS: Apparently it is now, so I
thought about it and I thought, well, you could make a
joke about gap analysis or you could make a joke about
matrix, but they 're not really funny, are they? So
what I was reminded of, though, years ago in the "New
Yorker," there was this great cartoon. There are two
men sitting in a bar. One turns to the other and says,
"Are you just whining or can you back that up with
data?"

[Laughter]

So I think that's where we are. So with regards to the questions for discussion regarding assessments, are the assumptions correct?

[No audible response]

Hearing no noes, what do you think of the name "Public Access Assessment?" Do you have a suggestion for a different name?

Steve?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. I want to go back to Number One.

And coming from an assessment sensitive institution right now in a position where assessment is everything we need to be doing it. For example in your first assumption with, you know, public access includes the main gap there that I don't see is the reference or information component. We're still in the administrative structure, you know, things and that sort of process, rather than.

The other in here I don't see is the target for this assessment. We have one, you know, the depository librarian, who is managing. We have their director, et cetera. What I don't see here is the great glorious Congress that, you know, has established a program to meet the information needs of the general

public and where that feedback loop goes back to them.
I really see your assessment as an opportunity to let
them know that the predominantly electronic depository
system meets the information needs of the general
public or they get the back news that says, "You know,
it's not doing what you thought it was going to do and
maybe you need to tweak it in there."

So it's a neutral. I think we have one
direction, which is those of us who actually do the
work, but there's also the process upward that says,
"It needs to be looked at because it's really not
accomplishing what you've set it out to accomplish,
other than provide access. It's here. You can get at
it. You can get at it, but did I walk away with what I
needed to do for myself?"

And I see that as still a gap in the
assessment and I don't know how you put it in there.

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi. Kathy Brazee for GPO.

Steve, do you mean the examples you provided,
is that what you meant by a target for the assessment
program?

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I think what you put in
the assumptions and you've got the process, but we
don't -- and you have a portion of the target 'cause
you're going to deliver the results back to the

institution, but where do you carry all that, aggregate it, and send it upward to indicate, "Oh, we've all done the assessment and you know, in the collective we're truly meeting the expectation that is implied within the law that, you know," -- what term do you use, the American Public, "is getting the information that they seek down to what level?"

You know, they're getting it in terms of "It's here. Have at it." Or I actually have, "I have the assumption or I have the perception of it. Thank you. You delivered it. I have a positive impression."

Well, then we're doing what we're supposed to do or did you get it? I got the piece of paper. Okay. That meetings it, et cetera.

So if that -- but the key is, where are we delivering this up so that it says collectively we're doing what we were really established to do, which is make the information needed by the public.

KATHY BRAZEE: Could we -- There's six questions here. After the sixth question, can we come back and see if we'd address some of that? And if there are patron satisfaction surveys, that may address some of it, as well. And certainly reports to Congress are on a regular basis.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Good. I think the

mechanism, we're getting there.

KATHY BRAZEE: Okay. Thanks.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Sandy MaAninch
[phonetic], University of Kentucky.

I'm going to have to leave pretty soon, so I
would like to make this comment and it's not exactly
reflected in the assumptions that one of your best ways
to tell whether somebody is doing what they need to do
in our new environment is look at their web page. I
know your text says that, but it doesn't come out very
strongly in your assumptions and I would really like to
encourage GPO to really focus on getting people to see
their web pages for their libraries as their front
door. And they don't look like the front door, as far
as government information goes in most cases, and I'm
speaking of myself, as well.

And that is often not under the control of
the coordinator and they -- we need help getting that
through to higher level that we've got to have that
operate as a front door to federal government
information.

KATHY BRAZEE: Thank you, Sandy. Point well
taken and well understood.

DENISE DAVIS: Okay. On to Question Two,
naming. Are there any thoughts about -- without doing

word smithing from the floor, clearly, but --

TIM BYRNE: Denise, Tim Byrne.

I think I'm find with Public Access
Assessment for the whole process and I think the
emphasis is a very -- it's a much more to this than
just going to visit the library.

What I would recommend is that you don't call
the visit to the library, if it's required, a "Public
Access Assessment." You just call it a library visit
because you've said you -- you know, the assumption is
the assessments should be viewed as a positive process
and I always try to communicate that to my selectives
that it was a positive, but it's an assessment and they
react that way. The become very defensive. I remember
once, you know, when I first came to Colorado and we
were being inspected, I told all the selectives, "The
inspector is your friend."

And then I got a call after an inspection and
they said, "That Gallatin [phonetic] was not my
friend."

[Laughter]

So I think that taking that out of the
business. The process is an assessment and a lot of
libraries will not be visited, but the visit itself,
try to make it less threatening.

KATHY BRAZEE: Point also well taken. Thank you.

DENISE DAVIS: Any comments? Okay.

Three: What specifically have you found regarding any inspections and/or self-studies in the past and believe you could find in Public Access Assessments in the future to be especially beneficial to your depository library?

Council?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, University of Missouri.

I thought the best part of the inspections that were both at my institution and then I sat in on as the Regional Librarian in Missouri, were simply the sharing of best practices and solutions and all of those kinds of things. I think everyone found those very beneficial; perhaps me more than the person being inspected.

ANN MILLER: Ann Miller.

One of the things that I found beneficial when I was inspected about 100 years, was the book that sort of said, "So, you're going to be inspected?"

One thing that wasn't beneficial was the picture on the front which was the guy on the ledge with the pigeons --

[Laughter]

-- ready to dump. But just, you know, the preparation, you know, the things that got sent out in advance.

TIM BYRNE: Thanks. Tim Byrne.

I've been inspected six times. The first inspection I had was right after I became a documents librarian and I got an excellent rating. And I realized very quickly my depository was not excellent. So I went to my first DLC meeting to complain about my excellent evaluation.

I have failed an inspection. I have gotten two full time positions out of inspections. And the thing that made me realize and this is what I try to communicate to others is that it is something that's being done to help you and you can get things out of it.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania.

I like the fact that it is changed from the word "inspection." I know that when I would go to be part of that process, that the people were shaking in their shoes when the "Feds were coming." But they also realized that they could also use this as a tool, as Tim was saying, with their administration to say, "The

Federal Government says I have to get two more people."

        And so you could use that as a tool. The
librarians could use that as tool to give some teeth to
the things that they needed and that was really a
useful part of the inspections and that at least for me
as a Regional, I can also use this as a tool for an
onsite visit because I tell my administrations, "The
Feds say I have to go." So that that was a really
useful way for me to get to see the length and breadth
of Pennsylvania and to get to see people that I
normally wouldn't get to see.

        RICHARD AKEROYD: Richard Akeroyd, New Mexico
State Library.

        I'm just speaking as a library administrator.
In many of our discussions, I hear a lot of you talk
about how difficult it is to get to your
administrations and to convince them of all the things
that you feel they need convincing of. I think from a
very positive perspective, these kinds of -- the
results of these visits, inspections, assessments, can
help you leverage what you need. It can also help
library administrators go to their funding authority,
usually state legislatures, to make case for what is
needed as a depository library.

        So from that very positive perspective, I

think these things can be very useful and I look
forward to them myself.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Sharon Partridge,
Jefferson County Public Library.

There are so many layers between me and my
Director that I suspect the sitting down with the
inspector was the only time my Director thought about
us being a depository. So that was always very
valuable.

Thank you.

DENISE DAVIS: Let's move on to Question
Four: Shall GPO routinely perform depository patron
satisfaction surveys about each library's depository
access, collections and service?

ANN MILLER: This is Ann miller.

In an ideal world, this would be nice, but I
would challenge you to figure out how to do that,
especially with many of us operating from merged
service points. People often use federal information
they don't necessarily realize that it's federal
information. We have depositories where the
collections are merged, where the depository collection
has been cataloged into the general collection.

So I think, you know, yeah. I'd be happy to
hear that, but I think the execution is going to be

difficult.

DENISE DAVIS: I guess I have a question for council. How do you all feel about sort of voluntary popup survey windows at the desktop to capture this sort of randomly by GPO?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, University of Missouri.

I like it. We're doing it anyway with other things. We could integrate that into our general assessment process.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: This is Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina.

I think the approach that I would prefer would be to try to integrate this into ongoing assessment that our library is already doing and that way it would integrate the administrations' way of looking at this as just another -- this is a service and it needs to be on par and evaluated with all the others.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: I'm Nancy Anders from the Library of Michigan.

I think this one kind of gets at the heart of the problem.

It doesn't matter to me whether GPO performs them or the library performs them or even if a peer

institution performs them. The problem is, is that there's a big disconnect here between what I'm hearing from primarily academic institutions about their routine assessment activities and what I see in smaller depositories where that's not on anyone's radar.

And the elephant in the room here is that we all know even in the former inspection process, it was very easy to get, as Tim says, an excellent rating and not have an impact on your community of any kind. You could kind of get your ticket punched and you know, there have always been some libraries that excelled at this and some that didn't. There have been Regionals that excel at it and some that don't. That's always been the elephant in the room.

And I think this is finally getting at the heart of the problem. Both the library has to perform some assessment, as well as GPO.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: And this is Bill Sudduth again.

And again, you know, one of the things that we're familiar with all academic institutions, no matter how large, is that there is a regional accreditation assessments and those usually come back with recommendations that then have to get addressed and how you respond to those. So again, taking that

kind of process into account might be important, too.

DENISE DAVIS: Question Five: Would you be interested in a self-assessment tool that is an updated self-study template and in what format would you like this to be available?

ANN MILLER: Ann Miller.

Yes, electronic.

MARK SANDLER: I guess -- this is Mark Sandler.

I guess that raises the question. I don't have a document center, so I don't want to self-assess myself, but I do think self-assessment, you know, is just a life skill and you know, I think we all sort of value the effort of professionals to assess their work and think about better ways to do it and be creative about being the best they can be at whatever it is they're doing, including documents work.

But I guess it puzzles me that the notion that it should be in an electronic form as if it's going to go anywhere. In other words, wouldn't self-assessment be done for oneself, as opposed to thinking it's going to be submitted because who would read it and why?

ANN MILLER: Mark, this is Ann again.

The only thing I was thinking of with

electronic was I just put the template on the web

electronically. I don't care where it goes. I don't

know about anybody else, but if I'm going to sit down

and self-assess myself, sitting in front of a blank

piece of paper is not conducive to self-assessment, you

know? I would like to have some leading questions and

that sort of thing.

DENISE DAVIS: I have a question for the

council and the audience.

In this concept of self-assessment, how much

competition is there between what your local

institution may require versus some high level

assessment categories that might be appropriate in this

kind of a tool and is -- might there be a way for us to

come to some agreement on, say, five or six categories

that would cross-walk between the two utilities so that

you're not -- if you've already worked on it for your

institution, you can bring it back into this tool so

that your -- and that the additional burden of more

questions on the GPO side would be minimized?

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne.

I think a lot of the things we do for our

institution are quantitative, not qualitative.

DENISE DAVIS: Mine is qualitative. My

performance is outcome based completely.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: This is Geoff Swindells, University of Missouri.

I actually think that we absolutely need to do that. And make sure that we're cognizant of the tools that are being used in all the different types of libraries, various parts of the community, and find ways that we can, as you say, "cross-walk" those because I think the best way of not doing assessment is to just pile this on to all the other things and my institution is going to support some of those other instruments more and if we can provide those linkages, it would be great.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame.

I think, if I understand your question, you know, assessment against what? You know, I'm thinking that okay for -- you assess, what do you learn? You know, the last time you assessed, you compared to yourself and did this. Others who select a similar number of item numbers, you're within this range. Others that have, you know, library of population size are within this range.

I mean, you can do assessment, but to what end? I mean, what is the measure you're going against? I mean, is it all self-knowledge where you know, "Yes. I'm doing wonderful." Compared to what? Or "No. I'm

doing poorly." Compared to what?

And how do you give a comparison that's in
there? You know, when we do those live quals, we make
them measure. You know, "Here's what I'm assessing
against and how well am I doing?"

I don't think we have that as a community
yet. What are we doing? You know, we're the small
public library as defined by population size, budget
size, whatever. I'm doing within what others have
done, you know. The ends within Duke is, "Well, within
a publicly or privately institute with a budget of
X millions of dollars, I'm doing okay. I'm doing
medium. I'm doing low."

I would think that would be useful for our
administrators to suddenly go, "Oh, wait. If we assume
you're doing, you should be within the top. You know,
and you're down here. What are we doing?"

And it's always back to, "So what does it
mean? What I do to change it? It's always there."

DENISE DAVIS: Okay. Let's move onto the
last question: What type of information, e.g., matrix,
about assessments would be useful for GPO to
disseminate about public access assessments?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells,
University of Missouri.

I think it's a little bit facetious, but I think that we need to provide a Denise Davis brain dump and ship it out through the system so that -- because I mean, there's a lot I think we don't know about assessment because we have tended I think in the past to look at our assessment, not in relation to other types of assessments going on and I'd really like to see that kind of comparative work going on before we launch into something new.

DENISE DAVIS: I'd just add an additional challenge is how libraries are changing what they report about themselves and in the public library community in the not too distant future, there will be two major matrix and that will be print and everything else. So the granularity that we're used to in media types is going away. So it's important that we recognize that we're in a place where what we do and how we do what we do and how we measure what we do is in flux, a more cautionary note.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: Nancy Anders from the Library of Michigan.

I have one more very general comment. I was kind of pleased to see in the assessment -- or assumptions, excuse me, that the statement was at least made that there should be consequences because those

have varied wildly over the years and mostly not in

there at all. And I'm not really sure where you're

going to go with that, but I'll be looking forward to

seeing more detail about that as the plan goes forward.

AUDIENCE SPEAKER: David Cismowski from the

California State Library.

I'd like, if I could, to revisit Number Five?

If by this question, Kathy, you're asking for

suggestions about how to develop a self-study template,

first of all, I think Ann is right. It does have to be

electronic. The end product has to be electronic and

savable because these things take some time and we

can't always do it in one session.

I would suggest that you not develop it

totally within GPO, that you involve some kind of focus

group activity or get input on the types of questions

that are really necessary to be asked and then test out

the instrument with some volunteer depositories. I

know in a bi-annual survey, the last one I received a

number of questions from my selectives in California as

to interpretation of the question. "What does this

mean?"

And I think by testing it out, you might be

able to see that some of the questions need to be

revised a little bit so that they're clearer;

otherwise, you might get -- you might not get the responses that you think you're going to get.

And then a final thing, try to make the end instrument as short as possible. The last self-study that our library had to do, fortunately I was not the depository coordinator at the time, but the person who did, ended up spending three weeks compiling all the information. It was a massive document.

And also it takes GPO a great deal of time to review these things and you know that.

So anyway --

KATHY BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO.

Regarding the last statement, yes, shorter the better. While thinking up something that is meaningful, but also less lengthy, certainly some Regional librarians have stepped up and commented. One of the first things I would really like to do, along with the team at GPO, is to query the Regional Librarians because they always go out and visit selectives within their state or region and perform consultation services. So they're performing in some ways -- sharing the best practices role that an inspector used to do.

And I agree about testing the questions at GPO. We got the same questions about the clarity of

the questions and some of that refers back to the
clarity of the document being referenced in the
instructions to depository libraries.

Hopefully the handbook will minimize the
confusion and there was a general assumption, so I
would say, "Well, you need to really explain what's in
the handbooks," that libraries know the rules and
regulations so they know how they will be assessed.

DENISE DAVIS: Are there any other comments
or questions?

TIM BYRNE: One, if I could? Tim Byrne.

Since you mentioned the role of the
Regionals, I would like to encourage that if you are
assessing libraries in this State and it's going to
require a number of visits, don't send three inspectors
to the State at the same time. If you are going to be
doing a number inspection state, don't think that you
have to do them all at the same time because it can be
a hardship on a Regional trying to get out three weeks
in a row to visit.

DENISE DAVIS: Thank you. Point well taken.

Well, thank you very much. Okay.

[Applause]

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Well, thank you very much.
That was a really good session and I think there is a

lot more that we're going to be talking about over assessment in the next year or so.

We're getting to that point. I know people have planes to catch and places to go, afternoon plans. Just a reminder the individuals who signed up for the U.S. Court of Appeals tour for 1:30, they need to meet in the main hotel lobby by 1:15.

Yes, Lance says. Shaking his head because when I said, "Lobby," I was wondering whether -- is it the lobby of the building or the lobby where they're going? But it's the lobby here in the hotel.

Ric Davis ask that he have a couple of minutes and so I'll have Ric come up now.

RIC DAVIS: Thank you, Bill. Ric Davis, Government Printing Office.

Just a couple of items in closing. I want to thank Katrina for bringing to my attention the issue in the last session about the digitization registry. Through technology, I validated with people back at GPO that they have fixed it in terms of working in --

[Voice off record]

I don't know if I'm that fast. Yeah. It works in Firefox. It works in Netscape. And by the time my plane lands, it better be working in Internet Explorer. So thank you very much for that.

Also, in keeping with the theme of this
conference on partnerships, to me there is no better
partnership than the one that GPO has with the
Depository Library Council. And with that, they really
become like family to us. We work very closely
together, a lot of behind the scenes work and I really
appreciate all their efforts.

We currently have terms that are ending in
September for several council members and I wanted to
publicly thank Walt Warnick, Susan Tulis, Evelyn
Frangakis, and Ann Miller and especially the leadership
of Bill Sudduth in helping us move forward and we
continue working with you -- we continue to look
forward to working with you in the future.

We are going to have some nice GPO medallions
and certificates that will be mailed to you. We didn't
want you to have you try to necessarily get those
through the airport and maybe get lost, so those will
be coming your way.

But again, thank you for a great session.

[Applause]

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: And I know that council
wants to thank GPO and the current staff one, for being
so open and accessible, making this what -- not to be
the transition period where things stall. I think this

is a group of library managers and individuals that
want to see the programs that they're working on
progress and they're very open and sincere about the
advice that when they ask us for advice and they're
very sincere and very responsive about.

Some of this advice, the advice when we give
it to them.

So you were about to reach for the mike for
something?

Okay. Okay. I know some of the members of
council left, but this has been a real honor this past
year to be Chair of this council, but also to have
served with the two previous classes that I worked with
before. I think we've gotten a lot done. The vision
document and I really would give Barbie, along with
those who came off last year, those who came on this
year, when I sent the cover letter out with the
document, it was a work of at least four classes of
council.

Council, I believe, is going to be working
towards more action items. They're going to have --
need the input of the community again for this, but --
and I will, if I can, be right there. It's -- the
thing about being Chair is as the year goes on, I got
the impression the Chair is the dumbest person in the

group because this is such a wonderful group. The

intelligence sitting down Monday afternoon and

listening to everybody, the level of contribution, the

level of expertise at times could have been

overwhelming, but I just really enjoyed it. I could

shut my eyes and just listen and walk out of there so

much smarter.

So I want to thank you all for the

opportunity and I think council, the rest of council,

really deserves the applause.

[Applause]

Now the last act that I get to do is to have

the incoming Chair of Council come in and actually drop

the gavel, if he has a few things that he wants to say,

he's more than welcome.

[Applause]

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Thanks, Bill.

A number of years ago, Bill beat me in a

hotly contested election for Chair of GODART. Actually

he won by a landslide and I've been nursing my

resentment ever since. And I'd like to take this

chance now to make him pay for that.

[Laughter]

No. Seriously --

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: That was the third time I

ran for Chair at GODART.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: It was a humiliating defeat.

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Ann beat me one year. She got her revenge by saying, "Bill, why don't you chair council?"

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: But seriously, I'd like to thank Bill for his tenure as Chair of Council. He now joins a long list of former council chairs and council members who now sit out in that audience, but give us their advice and their experience and their expertise and we call on them constantly and now we will be calling on Bill constantly, at least I will, over the coming months.

And as a small token of our appreciation for Bill's leadership, I'd like to present him with a small gift from members of council.

[Applause]

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Thank you. Okay.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: It's a gift certificate for restaurants.com or restaurant.com and it's redeemable at many places. So anyway, and I thought he might be able to take his family out since he'll get to see them maybe more. Anyway --

WILLIAM SUDDUTH: Or take council.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Yes. That's actually what we had planned.

But with that, and with no further adieu, I'd like to say that the 69th Meeting of the Depository Library Council is adjourned.

[Off the record; conference finished]

STATE OF COLORADO   )

) ss.   CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF DENVER   )

       I, Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Colorado, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcription from the digital recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

   I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken, and further that I am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

       In witness whereof, I have affixed my signature and seal this 30th day of April, 2007.

My commission expires August 16, 2010.

_____

    Christopher Boone, Digital Reporter