



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

**U.S. International Exchange Service
Findings from Survey of Partners**

**Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate
April 15, 2010**

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Executive Summary | 3 |
| 2. Survey Methodology..... | 3 |
| 2.1 Purpose of Survey | 4 |
| 2.2 Identification of Survey Recipients..... | 4 |
| 2.3 Development of Survey Questions | 4 |
| 2.4 Testing Survey..... | 4 |
| 3. Administration of Survey | 4 |
| 4. Analyses and Summaries of Survey Responses..... | 5 |
| 4.1 Preferred Format | 5 |
| Responses to Multiple Choice Questions..... | 5 |
| Explanatory Comments..... | 6 |
| 4.2 Downloading U.S. Official Publications..... | 6 |
| 4.3 Archiving U.S. Official Publications..... | 7 |
| Responses to Multiple Choice Questions..... | 7 |
| 4.4 Bibliographic Data..... | 7 |
| Responses to Multiple Choice Questions..... | 7 |
| Explanatory Comments..... | 8 |
| 4.5 Negotiating Rights to Archive Foreign Official Publications | 8 |
| Explanatory Comments..... | 8 |
| 4.6 Other Explanatory Comments..... | 8 |
| 5. Recommendations Based on Survey Responses | 9 |
| 6. Recommendation to Test Bibliographic Record Distribution | 9 |
| Appendix 1. Survey Cover Letter | 10 |
| Appendix 2. Survey | 11 |

U.S. International Exchange Service Findings from Survey of Partners

1. Executive Summary

In order to sustain the free flow of national government information, the Library of Congress (LC) has undertaken a project to transform the U.S. International Exchange Service (IES) program. The transformation effort expects to embrace the analog and digital publishing environment; to achieve a flexibility sufficient to meet individual country needs in terms of the format of the content delivered to them; to recommend or identify tools to ingest, archive, preserve, and provide access to digital content received by the Library under the IES; and to meet the Library's continuing collection development needs. As part of the information gathering process, the Library issued a survey to its partners.

The survey was sent to all 95 IES partners. Forty-nine partners submitted responses. The survey responses revealed that the majority of partners have a preference for receiving U.S. publications in print or online digital format. There is markedly little preference for receiving publications in microform or physical digital formats. Ten of the 49 respondents reported that their libraries are ready to download and archive U.S. publications. However, the rights issues for all parties to download and archive foreign official publications are very complex indeed. Only 16 respondents supplied any kind of contact information within their government for intellectual property rights and permissions. A majority of the respondents is interested in having U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) MARC21 bibliographic data.

2. Survey Methodology

A committee was formed in July 2009 to develop and implement the survey and to analyze the responses. The members are: Mark Addison, Robert Dardano, Youngsim Leigh, Judy Mansfield (chair), Richard Yarnall, and Nina Zanegina. The committee received support from Delonte Boxley who developed spreadsheets to support analysis and from many acquisitions specialists, who researched the names and addresses of the current library directors of all of the 95 libraries that were to receive the survey. Within the committee, there is more than 62 years of experience with the IES.

2.1 Purpose of Survey

The survey was conducted in order to get a better idea of the needs and capabilities of IES partners in terms of the Service over the next five years and an understanding of how the U.S. can most effectively meet the needs for U.S. government documents.

2.2 Identification of Survey Recipients

The survey recipients were the 95 libraries currently identified as IES partners by virtue of receiving U.S. official publications from the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) under United States Code Title 44, Section 1719.

2.3 Development of Survey Questions

The questions in the survey were written to determine which format was the preferred format for partners to receive U.S. official publications; what the partner's capabilities and preferences were for archiving U.S. official publications; the partner's interest in GPO bibliographic data; and to identify the responsible authority in the countries of partners for granting rights to download and archive official publications of those countries. The question format was multiple-choice with space provided for explanatory comments.

2.4 Testing Survey

In order to get input on the clarity of the wording and grammatical structure of the survey questions, the committee tested the survey with partner libraries where the staff did not have English as a first language. To that end, the survey draft was administered to staff at three partner institutions in September 2009: the Russian State Library, the National Assembly Library of Korea, and the National Library of Korea. (These partners were chosen because committee members had pre-existing travel plans which included visits to these institutions, thus allowing a face-to-face discussion of the instrument.)

In addition, the Chair took the draft survey to the business meeting of the Standing Committee of the IFLA Acquisition and Collection Development Section in August 2009 for the purpose of soliciting feedback on the wording of the questions in the survey. All groups provided comments which were used to refine the survey instrument.

3. Administration of Survey

The survey (Appendix 2) was mailed, with a cover letter (Appendix 1), to the directors of the 95 partner libraries on October 23, 2009, with a requested return date of December 7, 2009. However, survey responses continued to arrive well into February 2010. The survey, the cover letter, and documents describing the IES transformation project were posted on the Library of Congress Acquisitions Internet site at <http://www.loc.gov/acq/>.

4. Analyses and Summaries of Survey Responses

Forty-nine partners responded to the survey, resulting in a response rate of 52%. The survey respondents represented all regions of the world and included national-level libraries, state libraries (from Canada and Australia), and special libraries. See table below.

| Region of World | Type of Library | | | Number of Libraries |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|---------------------|
| | National-level | State | Special | |
| Europe | 21 | | 2 | 23 |
| Oceania | 3 | 5 | | 8 |
| Asia | 6 | | | 6 |
| North America | 1 | 5 | | 6 |
| South America | 3 | | | 3 |
| Africa | 3 | | | 3 |
| Total | 37 | 10 | 2 | 49 |

Not every respondent answered every question in the survey. This made it more difficult to analyze the data from the survey and to interpret it. Also, the committee cannot be certain that it interpreted every response and/or comment correctly.

Responses to multiple choice questions were recorded in an Excel spreadsheet and then analyzed and summarized for the purpose of this report. In order to correlate responses to related multiple choice questions, additional spreadsheets were developed.

Explanatory comments provided by the partners were reviewed and summarized. A total of 31 of the 49 institutions that answered the survey included explanatory comments.

The survey responses are summarized and presented as follows:

Responses to Multiple Choice Questions (more or less in the order in which the questions were presented in the survey)

Explanatory Comments provided on the survey form

INTERPRETATION of data from the Survey Committee (in italic font)

4.1 Preferred Format

Responses to Multiple Choice Questions

In question 1, respondents were asked to indicate in which format they preferred to receive U.S. Government publications through the U.S. International Exchange Service, the choices being Print, Microform, Physical Digital (i.e., CD/DVD) and Online Digital via the Internet. Eight of the ten state libraries preferred online digital access. The national-level libraries were split between their preference for receiving material in the print format (14 partners) and receiving it online (17 partners).

| Preferred Format | Type of Library | | | Number of Libraries |
|------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|---------------------|
| | National-level | State | Special | |
| Print | 14 | 1 | 1 | 16 |
| Online digital | 17 | 8 | 1 | 26 |
| Total | 31 | 9 | 2 | 42 |

INTERPRETATION: It is likely that national-level libraries have a commitment to archive materials and print may still be the best archival format for some, but clearly there is already a great deal of acceptance for digital content.

Microform was chosen as the least preferred format by national-level libraries and edged out physical digital as the least desirable by state libraries.

INTERPRETATION: This likely reflects the unpopularity of the microform medium due to both equipment and user issues and the poor reputation of physical digital media for durability, compatibility, and sustainability.

Explanatory Comments

Six respondents (five national-level and one special) supplied comments stating that they preferred to continue receiving U.S. government publications in print and five institutions specifically stated in the comments that they preferred to receive access to online publications.

INTERPRETATION: Libraries may prefer digital publications, not only for collection development policy reasons, but also because the costs of housing and serving print publications may not be justified by user demand.

Three respondents stated that they do not want to receive microform material and two do not wish to receive physical digital products. In fact, one library noted that some CD/DVDs are already obsolete because of software incompatibility.

4.2 Downloading U.S. Official Publications

Thirty of the 49 respondents (61%) indicated in their responses to question 2 that they would accept the downloading of online digital U.S. Government publications as fulfillment of LC's obligations under our exchange agreement. In that population were twenty-one of the 37 national-level libraries (57%), eight of the ten state libraries (80%), and one of the two special libraries.

INTERPRETATION: Again, there is significant acceptance of online digital content for the purpose of exchange.

4.3 Archiving U.S. Official Publications

Responses to Multiple Choice Questions

Of the 30 institutions that would accept the downloading of U.S. Government publications as fulfillment of LC's obligations, 13 or 43% said in response to question 3 that they would archive online digital publications.

On this matter there was a disparity between national-level and state libraries: 52% of the national-level libraries would archive online digital publications but only 25% of state libraries would do the same.

INTERPRETATION: There may be several reasons why LC's partners would not want to archive U.S. publications: limitations on resources, lack of technical capability, collection development policies, etc. Also, national-level libraries are more likely to be obligated to serve as archival repositories for official government publications of other countries, hence their higher positive response rate.

Of the 13 libraries that said that they would archive U.S. Government online digital publications, 77% reported in question 4 that they currently had the technical capability to do so.

Further, ten libraries responded in the affirmative to questions 2, 3, and 4 that they would accept downloading of online digital U.S. publications as fulfillment of LC's obligations, that they would archive U.S. publications, and that they currently had the technical capability to do so.

| Region of World | Type of Library | | Number of Libraries |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------|
| | National-level | State | |
| Europe | 3 | | 3 |
| Asia | 3 | | 3 |
| North America | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Africa | 2 | | 2 |
| Total | 9 | 1 | 10 |

An eleventh library (national-level) qualified its response by saying that it would archive only selectively.

4.4 Bibliographic Data

Responses to Multiple Choice Questions

In response to question 5, 65% of the responding institutions were interested in having bibliographic data for the material they receive (65% for national-level libraries; 60% for state libraries; and 100% for special libraries). The MARC21 format was preferred by

88% of those respondents. UNIMARC, MARCXML, and MODS were each mentioned in a single instance as an alternative.

In response to question 8, 19 of the 49 responding institutions (39%) said that bibliographic data was available for the online digital publications of their national governments.

Explanatory Comments

Two partners commented on the issue of bibliographic records with one saying it would like to download only those records it needs.

Another library wishes to provide access to U.S. official publications on the GPO web site via GPO MARC21 records containing URLs for the individual titles.

INTERPRETATION: In this latter instance, LC would want to retain this library as an IES partner in order for LC to continue to receive distributions. However, it is clear that this library does not wish to have anything from the U.S. other than the GPO MARC21 bibliographic data.

4.5 Negotiating Rights to Archive Foreign Official Publications

Explanatory Comments

Of the 49 respondents, sixteen supplied some kind of information, generally not very specific, regarding rights and permissions for downloading and archiving official publications by LC. Six national-level libraries commented that there was no central authority in their countries to grant permission to download and archive official publications available online -- indicating that LC would have to work with individual government agencies in order to gain permissions.

INTERPRETATION: This will affect how the treaties with these countries are renegotiated and written.

4.6 Other Explanatory Comments

Six institutions no longer wish to participate in the IES program. The breakdown of those six is two national-level libraries located in Europe, three state libraries located in Australia, and one special library located in Europe. The agreements currently in place for these institutions are not covered by treaties.

Two institutions noted that they are unable to access online publications, and therefore cannot provide access to them to their users.

CONCLUSION: These partners will need to continue receiving print material.

5. Recommendations Based on Survey Responses

5.1 Where possible for GPO, continue to supply print publications for the foreseeable future (*Decision: affirmed*)

5.2 Provide access to GPO MARC21 bibliographic data from an LC server (*Decision: affirmed*)

5.3 Establish a range of service/subscription models for full-set partners

- Current Service As-Is (*Decision: affirmed*)
- Current Service Minus Microforms (*Decision: consider for fiscal year 2012*)
- Current Service Minus Physical Digital (i.e., CD/DVD) (*Decision: consider for fiscal year 2012*)
- Current Service Minus Microforms and Physical Digital (*Decision: consider for fiscal year 2012*)
- MARC Records Only (i.e., provide access to GPO MARC21 bibliographic data on the LC server in exchange for publications LC receives from partners that do not wish to receive any tangible distributions from GPO) (*Decision: affirmed*)

5.4 Formulate a pilot to test the feasibility of a purely digital exchange relationship. Identify two to five partners with which LC could conduct digital exchange; negotiate intellectual property rights for both parties; establish a new treaty or agreement; and exchange bibliographic data electronically (*Decision: affirmed*)

6. Recommendation to Test Bibliographic Record Distribution

Background: In January 2010, Nina Palmin and staff of the Integrated Library System Program Office (ILSPO) met with GPO representatives to discuss the possibility of making GPO bibliographic data (for the IES titles) available to LC's International Exchange Service (IES) partners. Although the titles list at <http://www.loc.gov/acq/IESFullLibrariesTitlesList.doc> appears to be short, the microfiche component of it is deceptively long. GPO staff agreed to build a test file of bibliographic records. ILS must test receiving files from GPO, making them available to IES partners, and partner retrieval of files. The frequency with which the file will be updated and the method to be used also need evaluation. ILSPO has already contributed time toward this project. In order to receive the IT support necessary to continue, ILSPO will need a formal request from ABA.

6.1 Approve formal request to ILS PO to proceed with accepting the test file from GPO and begin testing (*Decision: affirmed*)

Appendix 1. Survey Cover Letter



THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
LIBRARY SERVICES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20540-4000

**DIRECTOR FOR ACQUISITIONS
AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS**

202-707-5137 (VOICE)
202-707-6269 (FAX)
bwig@loc.gov (EMAIL)

October 23, 2009

Dear

In order to sustain the free flow of national government information, the Library of Congress has undertaken a project to transform the U.S. International Exchange Service (IES) program. The transformation effort expects to embrace the analog and digital publishing environment; to achieve a flexibility sufficient to meet individual country needs in terms of the format of the content delivered to them; to recommend or identify tools to ingest, archive, preserve, and provide access to digital content received by the Library under the IES; and to meet the Library's continuing collection development needs. As part of the information gathering process, the Library is issuing the enclosed survey. We are conducting this survey in order to get a better idea of the needs and capabilities of our partners over the next five years. We are especially interested in understanding how we can most effectively provide U.S. government publications to our partners.

In addition to completing the survey questions, we ask that you provide us with address and contact information so that we can update our records for your institution. Any comments or suggestions about how we can improve the International Exchange Service are also welcome. The information you provide will have no effect on the material you receive under the IES program or on your participation in the Library of Congress Duplicate Materials Exchange Program. This is only a survey and nothing you tell us will be binding.

Thank you for taking the time to reply to our survey. You have the option to download the survey from <http://www.loc.gov/acq/> and return it via email, fax, or postal mail. The addresses are listed at the end of the survey form. Please return the survey by December 7, 2009.

Sincerely yours,

Beacher J. Wiggins
Director for Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Access



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

United States International Exchange Service Survey of Partners October 2009

*The Library of Congress (LC) requests the following information from our partners in the United States International Exchange Service (IES). Please complete this survey questionnaire and return it to LC by **December 7, 2009**, at one of the addresses indicated at the end of this form. This survey can also be downloaded from: <http://www.loc.gov/acq> and submitted to one of the addresses at the end of this form.*

Name of Respondent: _____

Title of Respondent: _____

Name of Institution: _____

eMail address: _____

Telephone number: _____

Fax number: _____

Questions:

1. In what format would your institution prefer to receive U.S. Government publications distributed through the U.S. International Exchange Service? The options are **print**, **microform**, **physical digital (i.e., CD/DVD)**, and **online digital (via the Internet)**.

Please indicate the priorities of your preferences with #1 being the highest priority.

_____ Print

_____ Microform

_____ Physical digital (i.e., CD/DVD)

_____ Online digital (via the Internet)

Comments: _____

2. Would your institution accept downloading of online digital U.S. Government publications via the Internet as fulfillment of LC's obligations under our exchange agreement?

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Not sure

3. If the answer to question 2 is Yes, would your institution archive U.S. Government online digital publications?

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Not sure

4. If the answer to question 3 is Yes, does your institution currently have the technical capability to archive online digital publications?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

5. Would your institution be interested in having bibliographic data for the U.S. Government publications that your institution receives?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

6. If the answer to question 5 is Yes, in which format does your institution prefer to have the data?

- MARC21
- MARCXML
- Other: identify the specific format _____

7. Who in your national government has the authority to decide if your government will permit LC to download and archive the online digital publications of your national government?

Name: _____

Title: _____

Office: _____

eMail address: _____

Telephone number: _____

Fax number: _____

8. Is there bibliographic data for the online digital publications of your national government?

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Not sure

9. If the answer to question 8 is Yes, what institution is responsible for supplying the bibliographic data and in what format is it stored?

Name of institution _____

Contact name _____

Format _____

10. Please use the space below to record your suggestions or comments regarding the U.S. IES program. You may write in your own language.

Confirmation of Current Contact Information:

11. Please provide the current address to which the U.S. should mail shipments of U.S. Government publications:

12. Please provide the current contact information for the office or staff member responsible for the U.S. IES program:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Office: _____

eMail address: _____

Telephone number: _____

Fax number: _____

Send this completed survey to Judy Mansfield via postal mail:

Chief, U.S./Anglo Division
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540-4270
U.S.A.

OR via fax: 1-202-707-2086

OR via email: juma@loc.gov