



Administrative Notes

Newsletter of the Federal Depository Library Program

Vol. 21, no. 11

GP 3.16/3-2:21/11

August 1, 2000

Depository Library Council Summary 2000 Spring Meeting

**April 9 – 12, 2000
Newport, Rhode Island**

Sunday, April 9, 2000, 8 – 10 p.m. session

Following dinner with Michael DiMario, Public Printer, and other GPO staff, Council met in working session. Due to travel difficulties two members were not in attendance. Duncan Aldrich, Chair, welcomed and introduced Council members.

Organizational matters were considered as the first order of business. Mary Redmond was selected the new Council Secretary, beginning with the fall 2000 meeting. Committee assignments were discussed with the suggestion of a possible new committee on technology. The Depository Council Handbook will be discussed later in the week. A new host for the Council discussion list will be established. Recommendations will need to be completed Wednesday morning to allow enough time for photocopying of the draft for Council and the audience.

GPO responses to each of last fall's recommendations were discussed. Many GPO staff were present to answer questions or clarify responses. Reports were heard from Council Committee and Working Group Chairs on the various accomplishments and activities since the last meeting. A few reports were deferred until the Monday morning meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Monday, April 10, 2000, First Plenary session

Council members present:

Duncan M. Aldrich, Chair, Mary Alice Baish, Maggie Farrell, Linda Fredericks, Diane L. Garner, Robert A. Hinton, Sharon Hogan, Paula Kaczmarek, Donna P. Koepp, Gregory W. Lawrence, Mary Redmond, Andrea Sevetson, Fred B. Wood.

Sheila McGarr, Chief of the Library Division at the Library Programs Service and Program Coordinator, welcomed all to Newport on behalf of the Government Printing Office. Ms. McGarr noted that there was an excellent turnout for this meeting, with even higher attendance than last fall's meeting in Kansas City. She announced two special events taking place this week. There will be a reception for all attendees this evening at the U.S. Naval War College. Additional contributors to this event are The Consortium of Rhode Island Academic and Research Libraries (CRIARL), Government Publication Librarians of New England (GPLNE), Marcive, Connecticut Government Documents Round Table, Autographics, Inc. and Congressional Information Service, Inc. There will be a tour Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning of the Redwood Library and Athenaeum, a National Registered Historic Landmark celebrating its 250th anniversary in 2000.

Duncan Aldrich, Council Chair, welcomed everyone to the spring 2000 Depository Library Council meeting. Chair Aldrich provided some background information about the Council. Council is an advisory body to the Public Printer and members are appointed by him. Council, organizationally, lies between GPO and depository libraries. He continued by surveying the audience to determine how many people were representing the various geographic regions of the country and types of libraries represented. Chair Aldrich then asked members of Council to introduce themselves. He then asked GPO staff to stand and introduce themselves. Chair Aldrich extended special thanks to the Electronic Information Committee, chaired by Maggie Farrell, for their report on the Transition Plan. Ms. Farrell is also the Chair-elect of Council and will preside over the next two meetings. He thanked Donna Koepp, Secretary of Council, who will put together Council minutes for this meeting.

Chair Aldrich invited the audience to make suggestions to members of Council, or to write notes to Council and drop them in the "suggestion ice bucket" at the front of the room. He also welcomed everyone to Council working sessions. They are all open meetings.

Barbara Weaver, Chief Information Officer of the Office of Library and Information Services, Rhode Island Department of Administration, welcomed all of us to Rhode Island. She shared with us some of her experiences when she was a Depository Library Council member beginning in 1979. She also recognized Dan O'Mahony for his service in providing continuing access to public information for the State of Rhode Island. She also reminded all of us that Council has been working on revisions to Title 44 since 1979.

Public Printer Michael DiMario welcomed all of us to the spring Depository Library Council meeting, and expressed his pleasure at coming before us on this occasion. He especially enjoys Council meetings in the field where depository libraries are located since it helps him put faces together with various places. This is part of our national community. It is a remarkable partnership that is not recognized as much as it should be. The fact that libraries contribute most of the monetary support for the FDLP is also little known and recognized.

Financially again this year, there is a continuation of the gradual reduction in funding from Congress that has been going on for years. This is known as flat funding and in reality is a reduction in funds available. The first hearing, which was in the House, was held February 1. It was relatively uneventful. The Senate hearing was held February 22, and it also was uneventful,

in fact quite friendly, starting off with praise for GPO's efforts at meeting the Y2K requirement, and in faithfully continuing the delivery of the Congressional Record and bills, etc.

The appropriations request that was submitted was for a 15% increase over last year's \$29.8 million budget, or \$34.5 million. This increase is entirely for the FDLP, and amounts to a \$4.6 million increase. Of the total amount requested, \$29.8 million is for the depository program, \$3.3 million is for cataloging and indexing, \$885,000 is for the international exchange program, and \$509,000 is for statutory distribution. Some of the increase will cover five new positions, which will support the depository library program and the cataloging and indexing program. It was pointed out in the House hearing that this increase in positions for the depository library program was being offset by a decrease in overall staffing of GPO. They are still below their statutory limit in number of personnel.

An increase of \$2 million is being sought to support the expansion of GPO Access, primarily hardware and software. This program has been extremely successful. There is also a very active outreach program with the Federal agencies, which will cause this program to grow even more. There is still a lack of understanding on the part of Congress that the electronic program costs money. Although the program can provide all of these publications free on the Web, the technology required to do so costs money. Expanded bandwidth is a necessity. GPO already has approval for the installation of a new T3 line, and this involves a \$200,000 charge for telephone service alone.

The electronic program, however, has saved millions in the cost of paper and distribution of publications. The auditors, Booz Allen, stated in their report that any savings realized in the transition to electronic, should be used for the expansion of the electronic program. The request also includes a \$1.26 million increase in the print program to cover distribution to libraries of large projects such as the new edition of the U.S. Code. The U.S. Code is revised every six years, and it is by statutory requirement that copies are printed and distributed to depository libraries, but Congress is resisting this anyway. Mr. DiMario paused in his report to extend a special thank you to Ridley Kessler for testifying as the ALA witness at the February House hearing in support of the appropriation request by GPO.

In addition to the S&E appropriation request, GPO is also asking for funding of Congressional Printing and Binding for \$80.8 million. This is a Congressional appropriation given to GPO to cover the cost of Congressional publications. Some of this is for increased volume due to the production of the six year revision of the U.S. Code. This is not for distribution to the libraries but the cost of production and distribution to Congress. GPO also looked at the production cost patterns of election years, which this year is, and factored in those increased costs. Congress scrutinized all this as well.

To cover the costs of major air conditioning improvements to the GPO building, \$6 million has been requested. This was also requested last year and not funded. The House told GPO to cover the costs of these improvements over a span of years by cost recovery through their products. The last time the air conditioning was improved it was a line item in the budget. GPO believes that this is an extraordinary expense that Congress should cover and last year the Senate agreed and supported their request with \$5 million, which was removed during the conference hearing.

The Senate staff again seemed to react favorably to this request, but in the House it is a continuing issue. We'll have to wait and see what happens in conference.

There is continuing reduction of the size of the agency. GPO has asked that the ceiling on the number of employees be placed at 3,285. This will include the 5 new positions being requested. This level will allow essential hires, but no expansion in the program. This is the lowest level GPO has reached in the past century. In 1971 when Mr. DiMario came to GPO there were 8,500 employees. Staffs in all areas are very dedicated, and performance is nearly flawless, notwithstanding some problems that are beyond their control, such as when a contractor defaults.

With the current climate in the House, further cuts are anticipated. GPO's total request may not be honored, but there are allocations that have been made within the committee that have been approved. Markup within the House committee will occur sometime in May. Nothing has been heard yet from the Senate side.

Overall financial performance last year resulted, as in the past two years, in a shortfall of \$5 million against a total budget of \$765 million. This occurred despite a 1% increase, from 6% to 7%, in the surcharge to agencies. That part of the program, however, is in the black. The GPO Access program has helped to save money, at the same time the Sales Program has been adversely affected by the GPO Access program offering, online, many of the publications that might have been sold.

There is currently a study underway, to be reported to Congress, of the bookstore program and the distribution program at Pueblo, Colorado. GPO will be attempting to make the bookstore program more viable.

Mr. DiMario pointed out that concerning the NTIS closing issue, his position and that of GPO differed from that of the National Commission on Library and Information Science (NCLIS). He felt that it would be inappropriate for him, as a presidential appointee, to take the stand proposed by NCLIS. He understands that the Department of Commerce had the support of the Executive Office to close NTIS, and it would not have been appropriate for him to oppose that position. However, he has always believed that the material going into the NTIS program was appropriate for the FDL P. He wants to go on record as supporting the concept of bringing NTIS into the FDL P. If the decision were made to close NTIS, GPO would then look to incorporate this material into the FDL P, given the necessary additional resources to do so. He added that the depository community and he personally had lost a very good friend and supporter this past winter with the death of Jeanne Simon, Chair of NCLIS.

Mr. DiMario expressed his pride in the work done by the FDL P, as well as other elements of GPO. He said that this is an excellent program that deserves higher recognition from our Government than what it gets.

Mr. DiMario announced the new appointees to the Depository Library Council (see Administrative Notes, v. 21, #6, 4/15/00).

Fran Buckley

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #6, 4/15/00

Gil Baldwin

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #6, 4/15/00

T.C. Evans

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #6, 4/15/00

GPO Information Exchange, Council and Audience, Q & A

Council

Paula Kaczmarek, question for T.C. Evans: Referring to the numbers of databases disseminated total and last year, asked if this is a larger increase than the previous year.

Audience

Diane Eidelman, Suffolk Cooperative Library System, asked a procedural question about when the responses to last year's recommendation would be discussed.

Council replied that that discussion had occurred in the Sunday night meeting as first order of business.

Cindi Wolff, LSU, addressed last year's recommendation and response number 3 on GPO Access Gateways. She reviewed the background and history of the establishment and development of Gateways, including the meeting of GPO and Gateway site representatives at the 1997 Council meeting in Clearwater Beach. She expressed her displeasure over GPO's lack of response to these first Gateways, and her regret that GPO would no longer offer them any support after September 2000.

Gil Baldwin, GPO, responded that LPS appreciated the great effort that has been made by Gateway sites since 1995, but that times have changed. His advice to Gateways is to look at how they can best benefit users today.

Maggie Farrell, Council, summarized what was discussed at the Council meeting Sunday evening. There was concern that thank yous be sent to Gateway sites and some official recognition made for their service.

Paula Kaczmarek, Council, asked how low end users would still be able to gain access to GPO Access. How do we in libraries direct the low end user? Perhaps an article in Administrative Notes would be helpful. This issue is a concern to Council, but Council also realizes that we must take what we have learned from the Gateway Project and move it forward to what we can do today.

Paula Kaczmarek, Council, asked a question of Cindi Wolff. Does Cindi have documentation on responses from the Gateways themselves?

Elizabeth Cowell, UC, San Diego, responded that a lot of this comes from a philosophical point of view. How can Gateways provide access to their users? They still need to be advised when new things come up, and they need to move away from dissemination toward an archive model.

Linda Fredericks, Council, expressed her belief that there was a feeling among the people there that the support received earlier wasn't needed any more, but that there is still a need for different kinds of support. There is a need for reference support, there is room for service partnerships with GPO and libraries to provide this help, and there still needs to be telnet connections for the visually impaired.

Fred Wood, Council, noted that there is still a need for partnerships with GPO, but the technology of the Gateways is in transformation. What the Gateways were doing before is now being done on the Web. We need to bring the program up to date.

T.C. Evans, GPO, responded that Telnet is still provided and GPO remains committed to that.

Andrea Sevetson, Council, stated that she was unclear about what the partnership requirements for consulting were before the dissolution of a partnership.

George Barnum, GPO, explained that there is a clause for ending a partnership, but he can't remember the documentation for the Gateway sites. He believes there were letters, but not a full partnership as we know them today. Gateways pre-date the service partnership concept. We only began talking about the Gateways as partners in Clearwater Beach.

Ann Miller, Duke, stated that although her institution has explored the opportunity, it has not been a partner or a gateway. She believes, however, that this is a good time to talk about these agreements as partnerships, looking at new and creative ways they could be used.

Duncan Aldrich, Council Chair, asked if there were questions on other issues related to the presentations this morning or other general questions directed toward GPO.

Sue Lyons, Rutgers Law Library, expressed her appreciation to GPO for the wonderful work they have done in making items available online. However, she is very concerned about permanent access and would like to hear more about what is being done to assure this.

Bernadine Abbot Hoduski, private citizen, noted that two depository librarians from LSU, Roberta Scull, retired and Council member in the 80s, and Jimmy Hoover, former Director of Government Documents Department who died recently, would be greatly interested in this discussion. Some way is needed to recognize and continue these Gateway relationships.

T.C. Evans, GPO, made the announcement based on a press release, just now received, stating that the Supreme Court, on April 17, 2000 will release their database for GPO Access. [Much congratulations and applause!]

Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico, as one of the original drafters of the FDLP service guidelines, expressed concern regarding GPO's Proposal #3 calling for depository libraries to provide service on all CD-ROMs distributed through the program. There is still difficulty in using and providing help with some of the CD-ROMs. He would like to have a clarification of what is meant by a reasonable level of service.

Andrea Severson, Council, expressed also that she would like to hear more on the meaning of "good faith effort."

Linda Fredericks, Council, would like to hear from the audience on how they are handling this situation, from stand-alone to network based. (A show of hands indicated that many others were experiencing the same thing.)

Greg Lawrence, Council, asked Dan Barkley whether or not he circulated CD-ROMs to faculty, thinking that perhaps he may have thought that this was against GPO policy.

Dan Barkley, UNM, stated that circulation was not a problem. It did, however, seem that GPO may be asking for a greater level of service on CD-ROMs than is provided in merely circulating them.

Cindi Wolff, LSU, asked if we needed to have a Mac? We do not have Windows NT. Do we need to instruct in SASS and SPSS?

Bette Siegel, State Library of Massachusetts, suggested that there be standard software on every PC.

Ridley Kessler, UNC, stated that the service guidelines are very different from the technical guidelines. He helped to write the service guidelines, and he likes the phraseology, "to the best of our ability." We should let sleeping dogs lie.

Nancy Ogg, Missouri Supreme Court Library, asked if there would be a response to the earlier question about permanent access.

George Barnum, GPO, stated that there would be permanent access procedures to archive and to the best of their ability, make electronic data available forever.

Monday afternoon, April 10, 2000, Plenary Session continued.

Chair Aldrich announced that we would continue with Council Committee reports on Action Items 1 and 2 and recommendations for Council action.

Maggie Farrell, Chair of the Electronic Transition Committee, presented "Report on GPO's Transition to a More Electronic FDLP" (see Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00). This report was made available to all attendees. This is not a draft, but a final report, unless there are grammatical errors or serious disagreements about it from Council. It is the hope of the

Committee that Council can go straight into recommendations and action items as a result of this report. Maggie thanked all those on the committee.

In addition to the report, Maggie stated that the committee would also be looking at two GPO proposals, Proposal #2, Increase the Minimum Technical Requirements for Public Access Workstations in Federal Depository Libraries; and Proposal #3, Revise the “Depository Library Service Guidelines for Government Information in Electronic Formats” to Establish a Service Requirement for Tangible Electronic Products. Comments on these two proposals given this morning are much appreciated. If there are additional comments, please talk to Maggie or another Committee member. This will be taken up in a Council Working Session sometime tomorrow.

Maggie asked for questions from Council. Duncan expressed thanks to Maggie and the Committee for their excellent work. This begins to push the electronic collection beyond the doors of the depository library.

Greg Lawrence, Chair of the Preservation and Archival Issues Committee, reported on his work on Action Item 6 from the fall 1999 Council meeting. This action item stated that Council recognizes the importance of preserving digital products distributed to the FDLP on tangible media. Accordingly, the Preservation Committee will examine issues concerning library cooperation in digital preservation activities, digital preservation training for depository librarians, and develop a draft assessment tool to list and describe at-risk titles distributed through FDLP. The Preservation Committee members will report to Council at the fall 2000 meeting and provide an assessment tool for review.

Mr. Lawrence has prepared a document “Risk Management of Digital Information: a Risk Assessment Workbook for Federal Depository Libraries,” as a discussion draft. He presented some of his findings from the preparation of this workbook.

It is Mr. Lawrence’s belief that any strategy will require procedures to preserve the information, and a management plan to organize and control the process. Key points in this process follow.

- A process must be established to regularly identify digital products that need preservation.
- Key to this identification process is content of the material being preserved.
- Since digital information is seeded with hazards, risk is always present in developing a strategy for preserving electronic content. Providing long-term access will require migrating data from one file structure or format to another and is more risky than refreshing data for shorter term access by periodic copying from one medium to another. Both strategies might be successfully employed in developing a national preservation infrastructure for depository materials.
- A general strategy of transferring data to an online environment with public access serves a purpose in that the continual use by the public would result in complaints if the data

were no longer working, and in that way demand institutional attention to fix the problem. This avoids the out-of-sight, out-of-mind problem that has already affected certain files in National Archives and the Smithsonian Institution, among others.

- Remember to look to possible root causes for failures in preservation management, which are frequently organizational or fiscal in origin.
- The FDLDP needs a successful risk management strategy that can be communicated effectively to many interested stakeholders. This includes non-depository colleagues, our library administrators, our organizational administration and our direct data users.
- We need to convey the idea that information is at risk, and we need to develop a way to quantify risk. The workbook that Mr. Lawrence has developed presents a risk management scale with two dimensions: risk probability and risk impact. The combined values are easy to map in a 2 dimensional decision matrix, using the probability and impact scales for x/y axis, giving an overall state of risk.

Mr. Lawrence's presentation was followed by questions from the audience and Council:

Connie Kyker, Indiana State University stated that training would be very important in implementing these measures. She also asked if GPO wasn't going to do all of the preservation for us.

Fran Buckley, GPO, replied that this is the whole emphasis of the partnership effort and cooperation with the agencies. GPO can not do it all. We will all need to work together. This is the focus of the electronic collection plan, but GPO just can't do it all alone. GPO will try to set up programs that can be implemented cooperatively through the Partnership Program.

Maggie Farrell, Council, emphasized that one of the concerns from GPO is the lack of resources. More effort in this direction would require diverting existing resources or asking for more. She offered the suggestion that inspectors could do some training when they are on the road. We must keep in mind the existing budget and prioritization.

Fran Buckley, GPO, said that they are trying to work smarter and are developing online tutorials and CDs to help with the training situation.

Maggie Farrell, Council, suggested that tutorials could be integrated into local training sessions which would be good.

Jyoti Pandit, SUNY at Stony Brook, asked about costs of preservation.

Greg Lawrence answered that there were direct and indirect costs. Costs escalate substantially when volume goes up. Floppy to floppy is easy and cheap. To standardize to a CD-ROM is probably more efficient. A read/write CD burner is about \$1200 to \$1500. Binders with special sleeves are \$3.00. It is well worth it in the long run.

Jyoti Pandit asked Mr. Lawrence if he had identified librarians who could do this procedure.

Greg Lawrence replied that training is simple. Setting up the procedures requires a greater understanding of the process.

Fran Buckley, GPO, reiterated that there is no comprehensive permanent public access/preservation program at this time. They are still at the rhetoric stage with no firm program yet. NARA, whose mission is a little different, is also working on testing and developing the process.

The Plenary Session adjourned.

The Depository Library Council resumed in Working Session at 3:45 p.m.

Council members looked over the agenda for the remainder of the meeting and decided which sessions they felt it necessary to attend and to report on to other Council members.

Chair Aldrich reviewed the questions from the audience that had been put in the ice bucket.

Self-studies were discussed. 50% of self-studies result in a personal inspection. Gil Baldwin pointed out that not everything leading to an in-house inspection is bad. New staff or change in departmental organization is frequently the reason. In this case GPO acts as consultant.

Council suggested that this might be further discussed and assigned to the Operations Committee.

There was a discussion of the fact that bills will be moving from fiche to electronic, as well as the Federal Register and Commerce Business Daily. Digital signatures are an issue. More and more agencies will have to deal with official status. There is an ongoing group working on the authentication issue in Congress. One of the issues in the House is that they want control over all of the versions of a bill introduced into the House. The various versions are now in GPO. LC maintains a bills database that GPO helps with. The Law Revision Counsel is involved with this issue. The question of permanent availability was raised about all versions of a bill. It was suggested that we might want to get an expert to address this issue at our fall meeting in Washington, D.C. There is a GPO commitment to preserve all that is on GPO Access, which would include the bills. Authenticity remains a problem. This may be a possible recommendation.

Chair Aldrich asked for Council reaction to the discussion of Gateways at this morning's meeting. Ways we might proceed were discussed. The sense of Council was that there definitely needed to be thank you letters sent, and there was concern over the future role of these institutions that made an investment at the time of establishing their gateways. Many liked the idea of an evaluation. An action item or recommendation seems to be in order on this issue.

Service guidelines and core competencies were discussed briefly. These will be covered in more detail when Maggie Farrell's report on the electronic transition is discussed.

Mary Redmond reported on the Operations Committee in Julia Wallace's absence. Council will continue to work on the cost and value evaluation after this afternoon's session.

Donna Koepp reported briefly on the Partnership Working Group. There have been discussions with George Barnum on specific ideas for raising the awareness of partnership opportunities.

Mary Alice Baish reported on NTIS closing down at the end of this fiscal year, and the NCLIS involvement, since they had just done an assessment in mid-March based on meetings in Washington and private sector meetings. All of the NCLIS documentation is on the NCLIS website. There are very strong feelings for NTIS to continue; the program is greatly needed. GPO has similar functions of dissemination, etc., and NARA has expressed some interest in working with GPO or taking over some of the functions. This may be an opportunity for GPO. There is a timeline for NTIS, which is given at the NCLIS website.

There are many other functions that NTIS carries out that are important in the future outcome of this issue. There are some implications of privatization, which we should be carefully monitoring. There are real risks to public information here. The Depository Library Council's mission is to advise the Public Printer, who has already taken a public stand on these issues. The best Council can do now is monitor the situation.

Council members then listed possible recommendations, commendations and action plans to direct their discussions in tomorrow's working session.

Tuesday, April 11, 2000, Second Plenary Session

Disposition of Depository Collection to National Archives and Records Administration was addressed by:

George D. Barnum, Electronic Collection Manager, LPS

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00

Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief, Depository Administration Branch, LPS

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00

Cataloging Branch Update was given by:

Thomas A. Downing, Chief, Cataloging Branch, LPS Cataloging and Locator Services

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00

Cataloging & Locator Tools Proposals were presented by:

Laurie B. Hall, Supervisory Program Analyst, LPS

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00

Council and Audience Q & A

Bernadine Abbot Hoduski, private citizen, had several questions concerning the permanent protection of materials that go through GPO. Archivists have a different view of record retention. Sometimes archivists even weed their collections. Some of GPO materials are not cataloged separately, i.e., Energy series. NARA has said that they had no legal requirement to preserve government publications. She would like to see a common definition of what needs to be preserved. Perhaps there should be a program to bring these folks together to discuss this common definition. If this doesn't work, then we need legislation. What are we using for our oversight protection now that there is no Joint Committee on Printing?

George Barnum said that for tangible materials that they are following the records schedule defined by law.

Fran Buckley answered that there is oversight from both GPO and NARA, which are both attempting to follow the law. They are working to improve the situation, including creating better definitions.

George Barnum stated that they (GPO/NARA) are beginning to understand this as a set of relationships with interacting responsibilities. The paper products require much different practices than the electronic data.

Cindi Wolff, LSU, asked if non-tangible electronic preservation is on hold?

George Barnum replied that it is being worked on now. At this point no records disposition schedules are being changed, pending the outcome of the court cases. The practical answer is that the agencies are expected to do the best they can until there is written guidance. They haven't started into the frontier of electronic resources yet.

Cindi Wolff, LSU, stated that as she understands it, there is no backup copy of electronic web based products outside of what GPO is doing.

Duncan Aldrich, Council, asked a question about where the metadata reside, OCLC or GPO?

Tad Downing replied that CORC is not available through the catalog. They are examining how the software works. Some of the catalogers are currently evaluating this.

George Barnum explained that CORC examines the tagging at the site. It shows the user what metadata it has been able to find. Site designers need to learn more about what metadata needs to be there so that it can be successfully used. GPO staff are working with the staff at U.S. Institute of Peace to see what needs to be done and then work out a methodology to accomplish this.

Duncan Aldrich, Council, stated that CORC goes along with a body of data and a way of looking at the data. It can be viewed as a Dublin Core record or a MARC record. CORC is a database

with the elements in it and they can be displayed in a variety of ways. They will investigate to determine how best to look at these records.

Andrea Sevetson, Council, stated that she was pleased to learn about the retro cataloging project in browse electronic titles, and asked when a PURL gets assigned.

Tad Downing explained that there was a weekly examination of records. A PURL is assigned when it is decided to make an item available through the New Electronic Titles (NET).

Diane Eidelman, Suffolk Cooperative Library System, asked if there was any kind of connection for the user to go between the browse titles and the electronic titles.

Laurie Hall replied that this is what they are trying to do. They want to focus new electronic titles on current things. The Online Monthly Catalog will represent everything.

Tad Downing explained that the intent is to make NET the current awareness tool, but that MoCat is comprehensive.

Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky, asked for confirmation that items being worked on in CORC will be in the MoCat, in some format, either MARC or Dublin Core.

Tad Downing confirmed that yes they will be represented in the catalog.

Sandy McAninch further asked if the Serial Set would be in the MoCat.

Tad Downing said that he assumed that they would be there. He stated that he would confirm that later.

Geoffrey Swindells, University of Missouri, stated that tighter links were needed between browse electronic titles and the electronic MoCat.

Laurie Hall responded that they have not yet talked about that, but that they will consider it.

The Plenary Session was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

The Depository Library Council resumed in Working Session at 10:30 a.m.

Chair Aldrich laid out what we needed to accomplish in the next 24 hours.

Andrea Sevetson led the discussion on cataloging and locator tools. She thanked Tad Downing and Laurie Hall for their work on this project.

A discussion of various points in the report followed. It was generally agreed that the service partnership idea was a good one for accomplishing the goals of the proposal. There was some agreement that phasing out the MoCat CD-ROM would be a good idea. There is a problem with the software that prepares this item. This is the best software to which GPO has a license but it

has no compression capability, so they cannot get much on one CD. It may still be needed by some of the smallest libraries. They could probably do better with an annual cumulative edition. The law still requires a pamphlet edition, a monthly list.

The Committee will continue work on this issue and come up with a recommendation, which will then be reviewed by Council as a whole.

Maggie Farrell led the discussion on the Report on GPO's Transition to a More Electronic FDLP. Council discussed whether or not this required a recommendation or a response to the report. Ms. Farrell stated that she believed that GPO was seeking guidance from Council and it is her desire that we move on it to create a guiding document for next year. With a limited budget GPO cannot do everything that is asked for here, so there needs to be some prioritization. Council also understands that changing Title 44 is not an easy process. We need to find a way around the law that will still offer opportunities beyond the depository library community for influence. We need to find outreach opportunities for GPO.

Council adjourned at 12:10 for lunch.

Council resumed the afternoon Working Session at 2:00 p.m.

Ms. Farrell continued the discussion of the Transition Report by stating that she would be willing to draft a general statement that will result in one philosophical recommendation stating that we are satisfied with the direction that GPO has taken so far and offering some direction on where they might go next.

Chair Aldrich asked for reactions to Proposal #1 on Redefining Depository Library Size Categories. This is resetting the definitions of library size to reflect the historic growth of physical collections. Chair Aldrich suggested that Council write a quick recommendation that GPO move ahead on the proposal. Some discussion followed, pointing out that new baselines from which to measure would probably not last 5 years. We are at the point of having to consider electronic data sources. The old measure is based on volumes of books. Things like this need to be reviewed on a regular schedule. It was generally agreed that we needed a recommendation asking that there be a cyclical review on measurements.

Proposal #2 to Increase the Minimum Technical Requirements for Public Access Workstations in Federal Depository Libraries at Regular Intervals was discussed next. There was some concern expressed about the timing and length of the update cycle and how it would effect inspections of depository libraries. It was unanimously decided to recommend implementation of this proposal with the addition of a statement asking GPO to articulate their expectations for the inspection process.

Proposal #3 to Revise the "Depository Library Public Service Guidelines for Government Information in Electronic Formats" to Establish a Service Requirement for Tangible Electronic Products, was discussed. After examining many pros and cons it was decided to not accept the proposal, but to make it an Action Item.

The GPO position on Gateways was discussed next. There was some sentiment that Council should not be in the middle of gateways and GPO, but since Council had asked GPO to respond to this situation last year, we must act in some way now. GPO will communicate with each of the Gateways in writing with a thank you and words of appreciation. The telnet or dial up will not be eliminated, because they must comply with ADA requirements for websites. It was pointed out that although the Gateways may now be considered service partnerships, the Gateways actually started before the partnership concept. They were retrofitted around the new program of partnerships. Council agreed to prepare a recommendation.

Mary Alice Baish brought up the issue of moving bills from microfiche to online. There is a problem of authentication if that is done. Until authentication can be provided we will need to continue with microfiche. Fran Buckley pointed out that this is the official source that Congress has been using, but there is no process yet for a digital signature. Ms. Baish added that this is the beginning of a much larger issue. There will be lots of documents that will need to be authenticated. Although there is a definite need to continue the microfiche bills, Mr. Buckley pointed out that there is pressure to eliminate all dual distribution. These bills are already online and they need to eliminate the redundancy in the microfiche distribution. This may be a very good argument for Congress to recommend that GPO utilize an authenticated digital signature. It was decided that Council would prepare a recommendation along the lines that Ms. Baish proposed.

The last item for consideration is our Census question recommending that GPO continue to distribute core materials in paper. Some of these products are distributed in paper and microfiche, as well as on the Web, resulting in duplicate dissemination. Mr. Buckley pointed out that specifying specific products would make it easier. This will call for a recommendation, which Council will work out.

Chair Aldrich went through the list of recommendations resulting from the prior discussions, and assigned Council members for drafting each.

Our list of possible commendations was reviewed and drafters assigned. The list of possible action items was discussed, narrowed down, and assigned to specific committees and working groups.

Council broke into working groups to commence drafting recommendations, commendations and action items.

Wednesday, April 12, 2000, Working Session, 8:00 a.m.

Council completed its work on the draft recommendations that would be presented at the Plenary Session this afternoon at 2:00.

The Council website was discussed. Paula Kaczmarek volunteered to be the Council webmaster/coordinator and will work with Joe Paskoski on any revisions or updates.

Chair Aldrich asked for further discussion on the handbook. It was moved and seconded to accept the updates. Diane Garner will get the revised copy to Chair Aldrich and he will take it from there.

The Electronic Transition Committee was discussed. Lacking any continuing assignment, this committee was dissolved.

The new Chair and Secretary of Council were nominated and voted on. Maggie Farrell will be the new Chair and Mary Redmond will be the new Secretary.

Maggie Farrell took over from Chair Aldrich the determination of Committee Chairs for the coming year.

Electronic Preservation Issues Committee, Donna Koepp, Chair
Greg Lawrence will continue as member until Fall
Partnership Working Group, Donna Koepp, Chair

Operations Committee, Linda Fredericks, Chair
Fred Wood
Mary Redmond
Working Group on Value, Mary Redmond
Paula Kaczmarek
Working Group on Core e-competencies, Bob Hinton, Chair
Diane Garner
Linda Fredericks

Cataloging and Locator Committee, Andrea Sevetson, Chair
Cathy Hartman
John Stevenson
Dena Hutto

Information Exchange/Communications Committee, Sharon Hogan, Chair
Fred Wood

Wednesday afternoon, April 12, 2000, Plenary Session

Chair Aldrich called the session to order. Copies of Draft Recommendations had been distributed to the audience. Members of Council reported on the spring 2000 Council Recommendations, Commendations and Action Items (see Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00).

There were no questions or comments from the audience.

Chair Aldrich thanked all of the GPO staff who helped to make this meeting a success, thanked the audience for their attention and thanked the Council members for their dedicated work. Donna Koepp was given a special thank you for her contribution as secretary.

Maggie Farrell, as incoming Chair took over the meeting. She thanked all the outgoing members of Council with chocolates. A special thank you was expressed to Duncan Aldrich for his excellent leadership during this past year.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Koepp
Secretary, Depository Library Council



Table of Contents

Summary, 2000 Spring Council Meeting	1
--	---

Administrative Notes is published in Washington, DC by the Superintendent of Documents, Library Programs Service, Government Printing Office, for the staffs of U.S. Federal Depository Libraries. It is published on the 15th day of each month; some months have additional issues. Postmaster send address changes to:

The Editor, Administrative Notes
U.S. Government Printing Office
Library Programs Service, SLLD
Washington, DC 20401

Internet access via World Wide Web at URL: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/dpos/adnotes.html
Editor: Marian W. MacGilvray (202) 512-1119 mmacgilvray@gpo.gov