*From:*           vwynn91@bellsouth.net
**Sent:**           Tuesday, June 24, 2014 3:38 PM
**To:**              alacoun@ala.org
**Cc:**              vwynn91@bellsouth.net; Jessica McGilvray; Emily Sheketoff
**Subject:**        [alacoun] Fw: ALA COL FDLP Task Force
**Attachments:**    ALA COL FDLP Final Report June 2014.docx

From: Vivian R. Wynn
Posting as Chair of the ALA Committee on Legislation

Dear Councilors,
I am pleased to be forwarding to you the final report of the COL FDLP Task Force.  The Committee on Legislation has also just received the report and will be hearing from the TF chair Maggie Farrell at our meetings in Las Vegas. COL will be working with this information and discussing next steps during our meetings.
 A very large thank you to all of the Task Force members and Maggie for all of their hard work since 2012.
 Safe travels,
Vivian

_____

 Sent from Windows Mail
 From: Maggie Farrell
                          PM
To:  (vwynn91@bellsouth.net)
Cc: Jessica McGilvray (jmcgilvray@alawash.org)

Vivian,

I am pleased to provide you with the final report of the Committee on Legislation, Federal Depository Library Program Task Force.  The report provides four recommendations drawing heavily on our recommendations from 2013.  In Appendix B, we provide a summary of the survey we conducted this past year. The survey responses reflect a consensus from across the association with 193 responses, 70 ALA members participated in the Open Dialogue at ALA Midwinter 2014, and ALA units were provided an opportunity to provide a formal response.

There is much work to be done to advance the FDLP but ALA possesses the expertise and infrastructure to lead change and advocate for the FDLP.  We are confident that ALA can provide the leadership necessary to navigate internal conversations to assist librarians and library workers in accessing FDLP resources.  The Task Force is available to answer additional questions and to assist with the implementation of the recommendations.

 Maggie Farrell
Dean of Libraries and Chair, ALA COL FDLP Task Force
University of Wyoming
1000 E. University Ave.
Laramie, WY 82071
307.766.3279
farrell@uwyo.edu

**ALA Committee on Legislation, Federal Depository Library Program Task Force**
**Final Report and Recommendations**
June 23, 2014

Maggie Farrell, Chair
Anne Elias
Janet Fisher
Lori Goetsch
Mary Mallory
Bruce Sarjeant
Laura Saurs
Robbie Sittel
Jessica McGilvray, ALA Staff
Vivian Wynn, Chair, Committee on Legislation, ex-officio

**Introduction**

The American Library Association Committee on Legislation (COL) formed the Federal Depository Library Program Task Force in 2012 to examine a set of questions and issues to guide the Committee on current aspects of the FDLP and options for the future. The U.S. Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), managed by the U.S. Government Printing Office, distributes federal information to depository libraries around the nation and the resources are used by FDLP libraries and nearly every library to access a variety of information critical to our democratic society. The success of the FDLP has been supported through numerous ALA resolutions, policies, and efforts and as such, ALA members have a vested interest in FDLP strategies to improve access to information through our libraries. The Task Force released its report to the COL in June 2013[1] and the recommendations are available in Appendix A. The Task Force was asked to continue for an additional year to outline a process for ALA to bring together diverse opinions and to guide COL in its future consideration of policies regarding the FDLP.

The Task Force selected one issue from its recommendations to further explore its complexity in order to understand how ALA might develop consensus and advance broad association goals. The Task Force selected a national preservation plan for depository materials. A preservation plan encompasses a variety of issues such as geographical distribution, metadata, partnerships, training, and advocacy. In order to solicit broad participation, in December 2013, the Task Force distributed an online survey to ALA members, invited ALA Divisions and Roundtables to formally respond to the survey, and conducted an open dialogue forum during ALA Midwinter 2014 in Philadelphia. The Task Force examined the feedback from the various units and members in developing its final recommendations focused on future processes and considerations for ALA that can guide future discussions and the work of ALA. The survey summary is available in Appendix B.

Of particular note, the survey process validated the Task Force recommendations of 2013. The conversations regarding a national preservation plan confirmed that depository materials are essential for libraries, ALA members from a variety of units are committed to the success of the FDLP, and that national strategies are required to advance the FDLP. ALA should and can play a significant role in ensuring current and future access to government information and that the entire association is able to provide expertise and assistance in this endeavor. The Task Force encourages COL to consider the 2013 Task Force recommendations and lead the effort to enact many of these strategies.

---

[1] http://tinyurl.com/FDLPReport

The Task Force strategically included many ALA units within its discussions and this method could be a model for future discussions and developing consensus within ALA.  By seeking broad input from many ALA units and including a variety of stakeholders, the Task Force was able to work through tensions and perspectives developing common goals in which our differences were minimized while individuals still had the opportunity to articulate their concerns.  The process of inclusion not only enabled the Task Force to see broad perspectives but also honored ALA members and units' expertise contributing to possible solutions.

Based on the 2013 Report and the 2014 Survey Summary, the Task Force makes the following recommendations.

**Recommendations**

A. *The Task Force reasserts their recommendations from their 2013 Report.  After an additional year of examining associated issues of the FDLP and ALA processes, the Task Force believes our recommendations are valid and deserve full consideration of COL and ALA.*  (see Appendix A)

B. The ALA community recognizes the value of government information and the many roles and contributions of all ALA units in the advancement of government information.  FDLP resources and services are important to many ALA units; not just GODORT.  There is broad interest in the success of the FDLP and ALA units should be consulted and included in the development of ALA policies.  For instance, ALCTS' expertise should be utilized when considering FDLP metadata and collection issues. GODORT within ALA can facilitate and lead broader conversations by including other ALA units in the formation of recommendations and strategies to advance FDLP.

    *The relationship between ALA and its units, specifically GODORT for FDLP issues, should be a collaborative and respectful relationship drawing on the strengths of ALA for advocacy and national policy while utilizing specialized units for expertise on processes and implementation of ALA policies.  This balance is possible through mutual respect and strong, frequent communication.*  (See 2013 Recommendation #15)

C. *ALA should take on a facilitative role in the development of a national preservation plan and other national initiatives.  This leadership role includes facilitating partnerships and strategies that advance the FDLP.*

D. *Government information is broadly used by all libraries therefore it is essential that librarians and library workers are competent in the use of FDLP resources and services.  GODORT in partnership with other ALA units should develop competencies for inclusion within the ALA Core Competencies of Librarianship.* (See 2013 Recommendation #13)

**Appendix A**

Recommendations from the *Federal Depository Library Program Task Force Report*, June 21, 2013. The full report is available at: http://tinyurl.com/FDLPReport

1.  Prior to destruction of collections for digitization, a comprehensive preservation plan is required that includes how many tangible copies should be available in FDLP collections.

2.  The GPO Registry can be a clearinghouse for digitization programs.  In addition, GPO should ingest and link to digital materials.

3.  Commercial endeavors can advance and enhance digital collections but fee based materials cannot replace free public access to FDLP materials.

4.  GPO should coordinate and facilitate digitization projects with the goal of national progress in making federal documents available to the public.  ALA can be a key partner in the planning and discussion of FDLP digital projects.  While GPO has responsibility for the FDLP, ALA can collaborate in the planning and implementation of national initiatives to advance FDLP goals.

5.  Knowing that not everything can be authenticated in a timely and cost efficient manner, priorities should be developed.  ALA could convene groups to identify which items must be authenticated and the priority order.  In addition, GPO could deputize or authorize other agencies/organizations as trustworthy agents.

6.  Documents will be digitized by libraries, consortiums, and other initiatives.  GPO cannot do everything so partnerships are encouraged. The documents community is available to contribute to the process and support GPO in this massive endeavor.  ALA could work with GPO on guidelines so the attributes of a trusted steward are clear to the community.

7.  It is possible for commercial sources to be trusted sources but these should be free to library users and follow the FDLP guidelines for substitution.  GPO cannot put the onus on FDLP libraries or their users to purchase commercial products.

8.  The FDLP should not move to a significant reduction of FDLP geographic distribution until a comprehensive preservation plan for legacy, tangible materials is created and implemented.  A comprehensive preservation plan would enable a discussion of a revised geographical distribution plan.  ALA could be a strategic partner in the development and implementation of a preservation plan.

9.  ALA can assist with and support education for all libraries on the value of federal information. This will extend the FDLP to non-FDLP libraries enhancing access for all citizens to federal information.

10. ALA and other professional organizations can partner with GPO in determining the appropriate geographic distribution as well as guidelines for potential partners to ensure digital storage, preservation, and access.

11. ALA accreditors should ensure that appropriate training/information on government information is provided in ALA accredited library schools.

12. ALA should continue to partner with GPO and supplement GPO training for a robust professional development program for FDLP and non-depository librarians and library staff.

13. The ALA competencies should include government information expertise, especially to focus on instructing library users in the reliability and authoritativeness of government information.  The competencies can be developed by ALA GODORT similar to other specialized competencies and/or

included in Library Support Specialists Certification program.  The LSSC competencies can be found at http://ala-apa.org/lssc/getting-started/which-competency-set-should-you-achieve/.

14. ALA can be a strategic partner with GPO in its efforts to expand content and functionality for FDsys.

15. ALA has robust infrastructure for communication, advocacy, and professional development.  This includes units who actively support and advance government information such as GODORT and the Legislative Assembly.  These components can be utilized to advance training and knowledge of government information tools and resources for FDLP librarians, ALA members, as well as the public.  Due to ALA's openness, these efforts will also be available to the library profession advancing the goals of the FDLP.

16. ALA should host a townhall meeting for all interested parties to assess interest and support for a potential coalition and determine the composition of the coalition.  The initial meeting will outline a formal communication mechanism to facilitate discussions among partners in the coalition.  The initial meeting should outline 3 to 5 specific, critical issues to focus on as a starting point for working together.  A progress report on these specific issues should be made available within a 3-month period following the date of the initial meeting to all interested parties.  An annual report should be distributed each year's of the coalition's existence.

17. The FDLP agreement outlines the requirements for FDLP libraries to commit to the program.  At this time, additional requirements are not required in an online environment.

18. GPO should continue to offer a variety of tools for the community and to partner with agencies as appropriate in developing tools for libraries.

19. GPO and ALA should use technology to expand education and communication as government information is essential for our citizens.

20. The FDLP core values remain fundamental in a digital environment and continue to be relevant.

21. The NAPA report provides suggestions for a more open and responsive program to meet the changing needs of FDLP libraries.  We need flexibility within Title 44 to adapt to current needs and expectations of our citizens.  ALA should be a leader in advocating for changes to Title 44 and facilitating discussions on the future of government FDLP legislation and regulations.

## Appendix B

Maggie Farrell, Chair
Anne Elias
Janet Fisher
Lori Goetsch
Mary Mallory
Bruce Sarjeant
Laura Saurs
Robbie Sittel
Jessica McGilvray, ALA Staff
Vivian Wynn, Chair, Committee on Legislation, ex-officio


The ALA Committee on Legislation (COL) appointed the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) Task Force in June 2012 to examine a set of questions and issues to guide COL on current aspects of the FDLP and options for the future of the program.  The Task Force examined six issues as identified by COL and released its report in June 2013 (http://tinyurl.com/FDLPReport).  The Task Force was asked to continue for a year to examine in more detail some of the recommendations in order to provide more insights into implementation of ideas.  The Task Force selected a national preservation plan as a model to further investigate as such a plan encompasses a variety of issues including metadata, discovery, authentication, partnerships, and the role of ALA.  The goal of the Task Force was not to develop a national preservation plan but to understand how such a plan might be implemented and coordinated within ALA and most importantly, the role of ALA in supporting, developing, and/or managing a national plan.

The Task Force developed a survey to look at the various issues within a national preservation plan.  The survey was open to all ALA members and incorporated three strategies to solicit broad participation:
- Online Survey with the option to request a paper survey
- Invitation to all ALA units to formally respond to the survey
- Open Dialogue Session during ALA Midwinter 2014

The Task Force promoted the survey through direct communication with all ALA members, ALA Council, and contacting every ALA unit.  The Task Force received 193 online responses, 70 members attended the Open Dialogue (some formally represented their ALA unit), and the Government Documents Roundtable (GODORT) provided a detailed response to the survey.  As a result, the Task Force believes that the following summary is a good representation of ALA members' perspectives.  These responses will guide the Task Force in its final recommendations to be released June 2014.

**Identification of Materials**

Federal agency publications should be preserved.

Many researchers, students, journalists, and members of the general public view information from national governments as a starting place -- an authoritative source. Also, even the most ephemeral federal publications can be helpful in unexpected ways.

A process of evaluation (retention schedules) should be developed to determine which materials have long-term value and how many copies need to be preserved.

Priority should be determined by demand; continued relevance; use statistics; format most likely to become obsolete; items not available in other formats; age of materials; type of materials; rarity; condition; user input; legal/Congressional basis; resources that provide historical and cultural insight; statistical data; quality of paper printed on; identified essential materials.  In addition, records need to be coordinated within the CGP to improve finding and accessing content.

Participants in the identification process include GPO, FDLs, NARA, Library of Congress, non-FDLP institutions, LIS programs, DPLA, not for profits (HathiTrust), and the Internet Archives, and possibly consortia formed from all groups working together.

Two differing opinions came out in the survey responses:
1) remove GPO from this role (preservation is not within their mandate)
2) keep GPO in a primary role since GPO is responsible for the FDLP and has legal authority with regards to the program

There were a number of comments that participants must sign a formal agreement with GPO in order to participate in a preservation program and agreeing to possible conditions.

Two groups were suggested to guide and provide leadership with this process (but not both together):
1) GPO
2) Advisory committee (not specified as to the participants)

There is a possibility that commercial partners may require users/libraries to buy access to preservation copies in future years, and therefore we should figure out how to allow public no fee access from the beginning

Whenever possible, tangible materials should be preserved in print format as well as digitized and preserved in some form of corresponding e-repository.

Massive duplication of most tangible FDLP materials by selective depository program participants (as is the present situation) will not be necessary if a comprehensive, open access e-repository can be developed.

**Preservation Methods**

- Digitization allows for wider discovery and access.
- Only in cases of rare or damaged publications does it serve as a form of preservation.
- Not all digitization is equal (whether it is the specs of actual digitization or the type of item being digitized), nor do we know how long digitized information lasts.
- There are no uniform digitizing standards even among organizations that digitize (LOC, HathiTrust, LOCKSS, CLOCKSS, Internet Archive, DPLA, NISO, different government agencies, etc.).
- Maintaining a digitized collection requires another set of knowledge and equipment; it's not a turnkey operation that takes care of itself once items are digitized, and it must be maintained against data loss, backed up regularly, and, like physical counterparts, be dispersed.
- There should be a uniform, high standard for digitizing that takes into account the different formats of items; however, different formats will require different standards by their very nature (maps, photographs, CD ROMs, datasets, and so on).
- Regional libraries still maintain their status as preservation centers for tangible items.
- Before any depository can commit to being a "preservation center", the concept, requirements [standards, expertise], and obligations needs to be defined.
- While regionals generally have the largest and most complete collections [and might provide rare materials for non-destructive scanning], it is a mistake to assume that all regionals can or want to be a permanent preservation center.

**Trusted Partners**

Respondents identified several characteristics and protocols for assessing and determining trusted partners.  Characters that predominated responses include:

- Stability
- Sustainability
- Security
- Privacy
- Trustworthy
- Integrity
- Respected

- Visibility
- Recognizability
- Longevity
- Perpetuity
- Renewability
- Commitment/Track Record
- Accountability/Transparency/Openness

Protocols are expectations for both the experience and the practices of possible trusted partners. Respondents are looking for partners with broad, deep, yet viable project experience; the potential to be certified via a process, e.g., the Center for Research Libraries' digital repositories' assessment and certification; and a clear succession plan to assure long-term/perpetual commitment.  Standards are also a key element.  Respondents desire partners who already abide by or would agree to abide by community, national, and FDLP standards for access, description, digitization, discovery, preservation, and permanence. Basic business plan elements are also suggested including identification of sufficient human and technical resources; a robust organization and IT infrastructure; a low cost/no cost/not-for-profit approach; risk management; and willing to engage in a contractual, legally-binding agreement. Another important feature for respondents is respectful relationships, meaning the ability to work with GPO and the government documents community on shared vision and goals and, experience with and understanding of government information.  Partners who recognize the unique aspects of government information are important to respondents as well.

With regard to commercial and not for profit entities as trusted partners, respondents were heavily in support, with some qualified responses that included support for not for profit, but not for commercial entities. The strong preference that partners must commit to no or low cost access and follow standards is repeated here. There are a few respondents who felt strongly that it is going to take both commercial and not for profit partners to make any kind of effort work. There are also a few flat out "no" responses that indicated a mistrust of commercial enterprises and profit motive and a concern that not for profits may not be sustainable entities. Here is a representative comment:

> Commercial entities will probably disqualify themselves as trusted partners if adequate definitions of responsibility are in place; trusted partners should provide long-term, free public access and have a succession plan in place to describe what happens if they ever choose to break the partnership. So, in general, commercial entities will probably NOT be relied on as trusted partners as their missions are, by law, motivated first by profit rather than by public access, public service or information preservation. Non-profit entities can be trusted partners as long as preservation and public/free access are inherent parts of their missions.

Many current initiatives are identified that can contribute to partnerships. The most mentioned possibilities are LOCKSS and HathiTrust, with several other governmental entities, academic consortia, libraries, higher education institutions, not for profit organizations, vendors, and commercial enterprises also mentioned. A complete list can be found in Appendix E.

**Registry and Identification**

The desire and need for a registry of preservation, digitized, and electronic federal publications is clear. The registry not only serves as an identification for what is available but could outline priorities and serve as a wish list for forthcoming projects. There was a sense of urgency in the comments that this work needs to be undertaken.

There was a clear sense that GPO can serve as a coordinator for cataloging and building a registry but that the task was too large for GPO alone to work on this project. GPO will need to build partnerships in this effort including but not limited to the Library of Congress, Regional or designated FDLP libraries, OCLC, HathiTrust, Marcive, and federal agencies. A number of people recommended that an advisory board or committee be developed to assist GPO in coordinating a registry.

As a coordinator, GPO's role would be to set forth standards, oversee consistency, and provide best practices. There was some willingness to have brief records initially that would be enhanced to full records. OCLC was mentioned several times as possessing services and capabilities to advance the goals of discovery, access, and full records. One comment was that crowdsourcing would be a method to fully catalog preservation materials.

A couple of comments said that we cannot wait any longer for GPO to fulfill this need and alternatives to GPO suggested a national non-profit organization, ALA, committee of GPO and FDLP Regionals, or OCLC.

Regarding the inclusion of commercial entities – there is a clear understanding of the business model for profit entities and that commercial partners could play a role in developing the registry. Perhaps some records might be donated to the effort while the commercial company adds value or additional access.

Most respondents were cautious about the role of commercial companies in a registry effort but several ideas were proposed such as a company providing brief records or providing free records after a time period such as five years. Some suggested that commercial entities not be included at all. However if commercial entities are involved in the development of a registry, free access to FDLP resources must be preserved and ideally enhanced.

Several suggested that GPO could outsource cataloging to a commercial company and that would speed up the development of a registry.

OCLC and HathiTrust regularly appear as possible partners who may contribute to solutions. Additional projects include: Open Archives Initiative, Arcadia Foundation, OLAC Metadata Set, ASERL, CIC, Google, TRAIL, Internet Archives, CIC, DPLA, and the many programs within the Library of Congress. It is likely that partners will be required in the development of a registry and the core values of free, open access to FDLP materials must be fundamental within any partner agreement.

**Broadening Expertise**

Most respondents viewed this topic from the standpoint of government publications as distinct collections with unique processing needs or from the standpoint of an anticipated merging of government publications with all other items in the library.

Government information specialists who responded to the survey value the differences in their collection knowledge and the importance of the government publication collections, stressing the knowledge of the classification system, knowledge of government organization and structure, and knowledge of the variety of formats in which it is produced and distributed. The complex nature of government publication collections requires continuous educational opportunities focused on a distinct audience.   Most other respondents want access to the information but do not want to hold the areas as separate. "Mainstreaming government documents is a must."

Library administrators mentioned their situations where it was necessary to cut staff and merge services, and that managing separate government publications collections with different processes is difficult to accommodate.  The administrators were looking at having similar tasks in each area and for CE opportunities to be used for all staff.

A variety of training models were suggested whether face-to-face, virtual, or virtual and self-paced. If there is a government information professional at the library, many mentioned the value of a "train the trainer" format. There was an emphasis among respondents of more sharing of expertise of depository librarians to non--FDLP librarians. All groups consistently mentioned similar types of training methods.

Core competencies relating to government information should be added to ALA's core competencies.  Some respondents recommended adding to the GODORT list of core competencies; however, those from non-GODORT backgrounds looked to ALA and possibly GPO for those standards.  In the survey responses, only GODORT members mentioned going to the GODORT site to find the core competencies.

There was a suggestion by a few that there be a professional certification for knowledge of this area of librarianship.

There were a few statements that painted a future where more government sources were digitized and discoverable (full keyword access).  In that environment, government documents would not be viewed as different from other information tools.

**Role of the American Library Association**

It is clear from member comments that ALA should have a leading role in developing a national preservation plan. ALA is clearly perceived as a national leader on FDLP issues and should use its strength for access to and preservation of federal information.

ALA can be a central lobbying point as it has the ability to pull together a diverse group of stakeholders. ALA has a national and respected voice as it is recognized nationally for its work with all libraries. In addition, ALA has a strong network connecting various groups and experts.

ALA's robust and reliable communication is able to create awareness and communicate concerns both internally and externally for members. One responder noted that "ALA is a stakeholder with a broad reach into the community."

The respondents differentiated between the role of ALA and GODORT and that the entire association, including all divisions and roundtables, should take an interest in government documents.

Most respondents commented on the role of ALA noting the strengths of the broader organization. Some non-GODORT members expect GODORT to have a greater role in leading national efforts while others expect ALA to provide that national leadership noting the stronger advocacy skills of ALA. Some responses stated that GODORT tends to get too much into details and its relationship with GPO is too close perhaps losing a broader vision. The challenge for ALA is using its national advocacy skills to unite broad association goals with the in-depth expertise of ALA units such as GODORT.

ALA can be a neutral entity in the development of a national preservation plan but there is frustration with a lack of progress and talking too much without real action. ALA not only needs to be a leader in the planning process but also a partner with other projects that are improving access to government information. In addition to coordinating activities within ALA, ALA has the capability to coordinate preservation among various groups such as state chapters, state library associations, smaller networks, etc. This currently not being done by any other group or leader.

ALA might assist with securing funding and/or grants for libraries who participate in a national plan. ALA might also provide leadership on projects that GPO is unable or unwilling to take on. ALA is able to bring together various strengths of the association in order to effectively make an impact. One response summarized the various comments and indeed the goal of the Task Force by noting that "ALA should harmonize competing and contradictory opinions within ALA."

**Appendix C**
**Survey Instrument**

ALA COL FDLP Task Force

Discussion Regarding the Development and Implementation
of a National Preservation Plan


Introduction

The American Library Association Committee on Legislation, Federal Depository Library
Program Task Force was created in 2012 to examine a set of questions and issues to guide the
Committee on current aspects of the FDLP and options for the future.  The U.S. Federal
Depository Library Program (FDLP), managed by the U.S. Government Printing Office
distributes federal information to depository libraries around the nation and the resources are
used by FDLP libraries and all libraries in order to access a variety of information critical to our
democratic life.  The success of the FDLP has been supported through numerous ALA
resolutions, policies, and efforts and as such, the ALA membership has a vested interest in
FDLP strategies to improve access to information through our libraries and membership.  The
Task Force released its report to the Committee in June 2013[2].  This report examined six issues
as identified by the Committee.  The Task Force was asked to continue for an additional year to
outline a process for ALA to bring together diverse opinions and to guide the Committee in its
future consideration of policies in relationship to the FDLP.

The Task Force is considering the components and process for a national preservation plan
since such a plan would incorporate a number of tasks within a work plan that has wide appeal
to most libraries:  digitization, preservation of tangible and online materials, cataloging, training,
advocacy, and coordination of the necessary work.  While the ideal preservation plan would be
implemented with many libraries, agencies, and commercial entities working in a coordinated
and single effort, the Task Force realizes that this is not possible for the moment.  But every
effort begins will small tasks and eventually builds toward a stated goal.  In consideration of the
following issues, please consider how the FDLP community might begin a process now that
would contribute toward and build the ideal program.

It is also critical to keep in mind the role of ALA.  The Task Force is looking for specific
suggestions on the role of ALA in the development of a national preservation plan.  Your advice,
suggestions, and comments should focus on how ALA might advise, assist, and coordinate the
efforts of a national preservation plan.

A comprehensive preservation plan includes digital documents supplemented with preserved
tangible collections with a yet-to-be-determined number of full print collections, in controlled
environments and in geographically dispersed locations.[3]  Please consider the following
discussion questions as the Task Force determines recommendations for the Committee in
advising ALA on possible future actions.

---

[2] http://tinyurl.com/FDLPReport
[3] National Academy of Public Administration. 2013. *Rebooting the Government Printing Office: keeping
America informed in the digital age.* p.32.  http://www.napawash.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/GPO-
Final.pdf

Discussion Questions

1. *Identification of Materials – in order to implement a preservation plan, it will be critical to outline a process for identification and processing on the national level. This collaboration will require the broad participation of libraries, commercial and not for profit organizations, agencies, and associations.*

   a. Do all tangible materials within the FDLP need to be preserved?

   b. Realizing that not everything can be preserved immediately, what should be the process for determining the priority plan?

   c. Who should be involved in preserving FDLP materials? GPO, FDLP libraries, commercial, and/or not for profit organizations?

2. *Preservation Methods – the processes for digitization and preservation are varied and some digitization is not necessarily preservation. There are a variety of projects that may contribute to a national preservation plan. The Task Force report affirms that there should be multiple locations and geographical distribution.*

   a. Is digitization a preservation standard or does it serve as a discovery/access resource or both?

   b. Should there be different standards for copies – more rigorous for congressional materials and less for pamphlets for example?

   c. What is the role of Regional FDLP libraries in preservation centers?

3. *Trusted Partners – the FDLP has a partnership program (*http://beta.fdlp.gov/about-the-fdlp/partnerships*) and the Task Force report notes that partnerships could be a critical component of a national preservation plan.*

   a. What are the qualifications of a trusted partner?

   b. Can commercial and not for profit entities be considered a trusted partner?

   c. What current initiatives exist that can contribute to partnerships? (LOCKSS and other initiatives).

4. *Registry and Identification – the FDLP has initiated a registry for digitization (*http://registry.fdlp.gov*) and this might be the basis for a preservation plan. The Task Force notes that cataloging tangible and online materials is still a critical component for any national efforts in discovering and accessing FDLP and other government information.*

   a. How should individual cataloging efforts be coordinated?

   b. How should commercial entities be incorporated with library efforts?

   c. What additional cataloging/identification projects exist that might contribute to a national effort?

5. *Broadening Expertise – in a distributed, electronic world of information, FDLP libraries are able to assist non-FDLP libraries and FDLP resources are more integrated with commercial information resources. The Task Force considers this an opportunity and challenge that will impact librarians and library workers regardless of type of library.*

    a. What are the professional development needs for librarians and library workers who may utilize FDLP information?

    b. How can expertise be spread to all librarians beyond FDLP designated librarians

    c. How can core competencies related to government information be developed for all librarians?

6. *The American Library Association has a vested interest in the development of skills, services, and advancement of the FDLP program. ALA's role is to assist and support librarians and library workers who work with government information. ALA's expertise contributes to national discussions and government policies and ALA can provide assistance in bringing together a variety of partners to advance a common goal.*

    a. How can ALA assist in the development of an FDLP preservation plan?

    b. How can ALA work with other association and entities to advance an FDLP preservation plan?

    c. What future actions should ALA pursue to advance an FDLP national preservation plan?

**Appendix D**

**U.S. Government Printing Office FDLP Partnership Requirements**
http://fdlp.gov/about-the-fdlp/partnerships#requirements

While each partnership is different, the purpose of these partnerships remains the same, to provide enhanced access to U.S. Government information.  Therefore, the following points are important considerations when thinking about entering into a partnership.

*Public Access*
Partners agree to provide the public with unrestricted, no-fee access.

*No Restrictions on Reuse*
It is critical that the partner(s) impose no restrictions on re-dissemination, which may impede the public's ability to use the information.

*Ownership*
Government information provided through the partnership must remain [in] the public domain. Partners retain intellectual property rights to any value-added software.

*System Admin/Security*
Provisions must be taken to ensure the uptime and integrity of the service (e.g., failover, backups, and firewalls.)

*Communication*
Partners must remain in regular contact (as defined by the agreement) with GPO.

**Appendix E**

**Current Initiatives Mentioned by Survey Respondents**

- Most mentioned:
  - LOCKSS-USDOCS
  - HathiTrust

- Government:
  - GPO / FDsys
  - GPO / FDLP GPO Partnerships,
  - http://fdlp.gov/about-the-fdlp/partnerships#
  - GPO / FDLP Digitization Projects Registry Contributors,
    http://registry.fdlp.gov/listings/listcontributor
  - Library of Congress NDIPP
  - Library of Congress American Memory Projects
  - National Archives and Records Administration / NARA
  - Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

- Academic Consortiums and Institutions:
  - Center for Research Libraries
  - TRAIL
  - ASERL
  - GWLA
  - CLOCKSS
  - University of North Texas

- Non-Profit:
  - JSTOR
  - PORTICO
  - DPLA
  - DPN
  - Internet Archive
  - Metaarchive
  - Chronopolis
  - AP Trust
  - iRODS

- Vendors or For-Profit:
  - Lexis-Nexis
  - Readex
  - ProQuest
  - Ebsco
  - Hein
  - West
  - Google