

*IT Procurement on Schedule*

*Office Gathers Feedback on  
Document Recordation*

*Second ITTRB Meeting*

## Selection Joint Issue Group

### *A Closer Look at Cooperative Efforts of Library Services and Copyright*

**Jeannine Panzera**

In the May 2003 issue, *ReNews* ran an article on the five Joint Issue Groups (JIGs) the Copyright Office formed with Library Services. This month, cochairs of the Selection JIG Thomas Bland of the Copyright Examining Division, and Mark Sweeney of Library Services, Preservation Reformatting Division, talked to *ReNews* about the objectives of their group, the cooperative efforts between the two service units, and the need for change in selection procedures.

It is well known throughout the Library that the Copyright Office is undergoing a major reengineering process. This process will have a large impact on Library Services because copyright deposits are an important acquisition source for the Library's collections. "It was in the interest of both the Copyright Office and Library Services to examine how selection is currently performed with an eye to developing a more integrated workflow that would benefit both operations," said Sweeney. Bland said that it was the general "recommendation by the [Copyright Process] Reengineering team to consider the possibility of change to increase efficient flow of materials." After reviewing the current processes, the Selection JIG members thought that some routine material could be sorted and selected by copyright examiners. "Many catalogers in the Copyright Office are actually already familiar with the Library's wants, guidelines, and expectations for selecting materials. We came to believe that, with adequate training, other staff members of the Register Claim Division could successfully select materials that were considered routine," Bland said.

PHOTO BY CHARLES GIBBONS



*Mark Sweeney (left) and Thomas Bland*

In addition to the cochairs, the Selection JIG members included Jan Lauridsen, Michael Neubert, Edward Malone from Library Services and Donna Clark, Cecile Horowitz, and Debbie Weinstein from the Copyright Office. The group was charged with documenting the current selection practice for material received through copyright, recommending ways to improve those practices, and designing a pilot program to test the recommenda-

*[Continues on back panel]*

# IT Procurement Proceeds on Schedule

Michael Burke

The present focus of the information technology (IT) front is on the procurement of contract resources to develop the new integrated software infrastructure. This article is a follow-on to my article in the June 2003 issue of *ReNews* and will describe the selection of FEDSIM (Federal Systems Integration and Management Center) for contract administration and Millennia Lite for the contract vehicle.

After consultation with the FEDSIM staff, specific dates were set for the key steps in the procurement process, and some of those steps have been completed. First and foremost, Reengineering Program Office (RPO) staff completed the drafting of the statement of objectives that outlines what the Copyright Office expects to accomplish with the new software infrastructure. The IT objectives are related back to the reengineered business processes, and the objectives are defined in terms of major system components. Contractors interested in doing the work will be required to submit proposals defining how they would provide a system to achieve the objectives, what software they would use, and how they would configure and integrate the software to meet the functional requirements.

On May 27, FEDSIM notified the Millennia Lite contractors about the impending solicitation and pointed them to a website constructed by Copyright Office staff that contains the draft statement of objectives for comment and a set of related documents. These documents include the Copyright Office process reengineering recommendations and the findings and recommendations from the IT requirements analysis. Interested contractors were invited to a June 2 briefing by RPO staff. Those contractors attending were provided with a description of the overarching goal to provide timely public service of high quality and were told how the Copyright Office envisions the achievement of that goal through new business processes supported by an integrated and responsive IT system.

On June 5 and 9, the interested contractors were afforded a further opportunity for a one-on-one dialog with RPO staff to obtain information that would allow them to prepare the best solutions. The number of contractors attending was encouraging and promised several good proposals.

The solicitation document will be released to the Millennia Lite Group 4 contractors following final adjustments and clarifications by RPO and FEDSIM staff. Proposals will be due into FEDSIM by July 21. The contractors' oral presentations will be conducted during the week of July 28 and a contract will be awarded by August 22. ■

## ITTRB Holds Second Meeting

Staff from the Reengineering Program Office held the second meeting with members of the Information Technology Technical Review Board (ITTRB) on May 20, 2003, in the Copyright Office.

Robert Dizard, Copyright Office Staff Director, updated the group on the overall reengineering effort. Mike Burke, Chief of the Copyright Automation Group, gave an IT (information technology) update and described the current IT acquisition process and acquisition schedule.

Members of the Board provided valuable input and guidance from their own experiences on topics including IT procurement, user involvement, and privacy and security issues. They also supported the Office's decision to use the Federal Systems Integration and Management Center (FEDSIM) to manage the procurement of contract resources to develop the new IT systems.

The group plans to reconvene in September after the Copyright Office awards the IT contract. The group could convene earlier if there is a need for additional insight on any aspect of the IT procurement process. ■

# Copyright Office Gathers Public Feedback on the Document Recordation Process

In June 2002, the Record Document (RD) Implementation Team presented its process redesign recommendations and draft procedures manual to the Business Process Reengineering Steering Committee. Register of Copyrights Marybeth Peters decided that, before proceeding with the design recommendations, the Office should consult with document customers. The purpose of the consultation was to evaluate how the Office handles the document recordation process. The information gained from the outreach meeting helped in clarifying the scope of responsibilities of the Documents Recordation Section. (See August 2002 *ReNews* for RD Implementation Team design recommendations).

Prior to scheduling a meeting with customers, the Office sent a questionnaire to 47 document filers and 11 document users asking for their views about the services the Office provides for recording documents. The Office received a number of responses to the questionnaire, and on March 31, 2003, thirteen frequent filers and users joined the Register and several Copyright Office staff at a meeting at the Copyright Office to discuss the information gathered from the questionnaire.

Discussion at the meeting focused on some questions relating to recording Notices of Termination, the potential future submission of documents electronically, usefulness of, or problems with, the Document Cover Sheet, and the recommended scope of examination of documents submitted for recordation.

The documents public outreach meeting was helpful in several respects. The group discussed the current Document Cover Sheet and found that some document filers view the current cover sheet as confusing or as a means to edit or expand the document. The Office plans to redesign the Document Cover Sheet and to rewrite the instructions so the cover sheet will contain only essential information that is not contained in

the document itself, such as contact information and certification language for photocopies. Document filers expressed their desire that the Office examine documents only for what is required by law, which includes checking for completeness, original signature, and legibility. Attendees were not eager for electronic filing of documents because they do not have the documents in electronic form currently, and there is a question about original signatures still required by the statute.

With the information gathered at the meeting, the Reengineering Program Office (RPO) will review Record Document job roles completed last year and revise them as appropriate. Also, based on the results of the public feedback, the RPO team will revise, as necessary, the Record Document procedures manual developed last year. ■

tions for the benefit of both service units.

Both Bland and Sweeney saw many positive results of the cooperative efforts of the two service units. “I think all group members gained detailed knowledge of Copyright Office processing procedures and an understanding of how Library Services selection officers and recommending officers interact with each other and the material,” said Sweeney. “Our recommended redesigned selection workflow should enable copyright examiners to make accurate selection decisions on most routine works while allowing Library Services selection officers to concentrate their efforts on selecting works that require their level of expertise. This division of labor should result in material moving quickly through both the Copyright Office and Library Services.” For Bland, it was “an excellent learning experience about selection. There were many details and difficult technical vocabulary that took some time to learn. But I learned a great deal about the Library and the usefulness of our [copyright] deposits and what happens to them after they leave our hands.”

Many issues were discussed at length, including the definition of the word *routine*. “*Routine* for Copyright typically means quick processing. This does not necessarily match what the Library considers ‘routine’ for its selection officers,” Bland said. But overall, Sweeney believes that the group “reached consensus fairly early in our deliberations that a significant amount of material being received on a daily basis and reviewed by Library Services selection officers could be identified as ‘routine’ with a known selection outcome based on existing collection policy statements. We also came to appreciate the ability of seasoned examiners to identify ‘routine’ works.”

For the Copyright Office, allowing its staff to make routine selection decisions could provide many benefits, including

accurate records of disposition of deposits to satisfy legal requirements; consistent application of selection criteria; and reduction of bottlenecks in workflow by having more people select material. Benefits for Library Services in having Copyright Office staff make routine selection decisions include eliminating redundant searching and selection activities and providing larger pools of staff trained to make routine selection decisions, thereby allowing Library of Congress selection officers to focus on material that requires the greatest amount of judgment. Library of Congress selection officers will continue to play a critical role in selecting nonroutine items for the Library’s collection and in training, coaching, and conducting quality reviews of the routine items selected by Copyright Office staff.

In early April, the Selection JIG presented its recommendations to the Register’s Conference. The proposal was very well received, and the group felt that it was worth pursuing. Through a suggested pilot project, the Selection JIG proposes to test the transfer of routine selection responsibilities for commercially published 408 Monograph (TX) and Performing Arts (PA) music materials to the Copyright Office. “We hope to get the pilot started in early 2004,” said Bland. The pilot will involve teams from the Examining Division’s Literary and Performing Arts sections following the draft pilot design and procedures prepared by the Selection JIG. The pilot will also include training staff in the Copyright Acquisitions Division in selecting voluntary 407 items.

Both Bland and Sweeney felt that the overall recommendations of the Selection JIG were quite promising. “I believe we made rational recommendations that should be a benefit to both Copyright Office and Library Services operations. The proof will be in a successful pilot. The ultimate objective is the pilot that will validate our selection recommendations,” Sweeney said. Bland also felt that the outcome was very beneficial. “We began by thinking outside the box: what would be most efficient? Was learning selection, tagging, etc. too intricate a process and too time-consuming for the Register Claim staff? Then we decided what was reasonable to be able to accomplish—and accomplish well.”

The full report of the Selection JIG is posted on the Copyright Reengineering website at [www.loc.gov/staff/copyright](http://www.loc.gov/staff/copyright). ■

*Jeannine Panzera is a summer intern in the Reengineering Program Office.*



**ReNews Reengineering Update**

Published by the Publications Section [LM-455].

Information and Reference Division, Copyright Office, Library of Congress

**Publications Staff**

Writer/Editors · Judith Nierman, 707-6816, and Ruth Sievers, 707-9168

Designer · Charles Gibbons, 707-3313