

**U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION
ON
LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE**

Thursday, June 27, 2002 10:20 a.m.

**Commission Office
1110 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Suite 820
Washington, D.C. 20005**

NCLIS Commissioners:

Martha Gould, Chair

Dr. Joan Challinor, Vice Chair

Rebecca Bingham

Dr. José -Marie Griffiths

Jack Hightower

Dr. Bobby Roberts

Dr. Robert Martin, Ex-Officio Member (Director, Institute of Museum and Library Services)

Winston Tabb (serves for the Librarian of Congress, Dr. James Billington)

NCLIS Staff:

Robert (Bob) Willard, Executive Director

Judith (Judy) Russell, Deputy Director

Denise Davis, Director, Statistics and Surveys

Forest (Woody) Horton, Jr., Consultant

MS. GOULD: Welcome everyone. It is a delight to be here in Washington, where the weather is hot, and humid, and smoggy, and where I may lose my voice again before the day is out.

[Laughter.]

MS. GOULD: The first thing I would like to do is to have everyone introduce themselves. We will start with Mr. Horton.

MR. HORTON: My name is Woody Horton. I'm a consultant to the Commission in the international area.

DR. MARTIN: I'm Robert Martin, Director of the Institute of Museum Library Services.

MS. BINGHAM: Rebecca Bingham. I'm a commissioner.

MR. HIGHTOWER: I'm Jack Hightower, and I understand this morning I'm about to become one of the senior members of the Commission.

[Laughter.]

DR. CHALLINOR: Joan Challinor. I serve at the discretion of Martha Gould.

MS. GOULD: Joan Challinor never serves at the discretion of Martha Gould. She serves.

[Laughter.]

MS. GOULD: I'm Martha Gould, and I currently serve as the Chair of the Commission.

MR. WILLARD: Bob Willard, Executive Director.

MS. RUSSELL: Judy Russell, Deputy Director.

DR. GRIFFITHS: José-Marie Griffiths, retiring member.

DR. ROBERTS: Bobby Roberts, member of the Commission.

MR. TABB: Winston Tabb, representing the Library of Congress.

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, staff.

MS. CONSTABLE: Mary Constable, from the ALA Washington office. Good morning, everyone.

MS. CHUTE: Mary Chute, Deputy Director, IMLS, Library Service.

MR. NEAL: Pat Neal, observer, Software and Information Industry Association.

MR. LEDUC: David LeDuc, observer, Director of Public Policy of the Software and Information Industry Association.

PARTICIPANT: I couldn't understand what you said.

MR. LEDUC: David LeDuc. I'm an observer. I'm the Director of Policy at the Software and Information Industry Association.

MS. GOULD: Welcome, and thank you.

I would like at this point to add two things to the agenda with the approval of the members of the Commission. I would like to add a recognition to Dr. Carbo, who will be retiring, I believe, at the dinner tonight for her. She's retiring as the Dean of the Pitt School of Information Sciences, University of --

MR. WILLARD: Pittsburgh.

MS. GOULD: Yes. Bob is going to talk to that. I'll remind you that Toni at one time did serve, I believe, as the Executive Director of the Commission.

Also, at this point, I'm going to ask José to introduce a resolution. And then under new business I will report on my China trip. When the executive director does his report, I would appreciate it if you would let him get through the report, and then when we go down through the rest of the agenda, you can ask him questions. In that way, it will sort of expedite the flow of what we are doing.

So discussion on the Executive Director's report, we'll hold off until after he has made the report.

So with that, Bob, would you go ahead and do the comments for --

DR. GRIFFITHS: Do you want to do the resolution as new business, or do you want to do the resolution now?

MS. GOULD: No. We'll do the resolution after we do Toni. No? We'll turn it around. Okay.

DR. GRIFFITHS: All right. Well --

MS. GOULD: We'll turn it around.

DR. GRIFFITHS: -- for those of you who have just joined us, we spent the earlier part of the morning looking at the National Library Board nominations, and it became clear to several of us, as we led up to this point, that there are three groups of libraries in particular that we would like to recognize for the work that they did on September 11th, and beyond. So let me read this resolution.

"I move that we acknowledge by special citation the outstanding leadership of the Arlington County, Virginia Public Library, the Army Library of the Pentagon, and the New York Public Library branch libraries, the outstanding leadership they demonstrated on September the 11th, 2001, and during the ensuing months, reinforcing the role of libraries as vital and trusted community resources. Specifically, I recommend that we create an outstanding leadership award for this purpose."

MR. HIGHTOWER: Is the motion -- is a second called for?

MS. GOULD: Well, because -- yes.

MR. HIGHTOWER: I would like to second the motion.

MS. GOULD: Is there any discussion?

DR. GRIFFITHS: I just wanted to say -- we have talked a lot as we have moved through our discussion on Trust and Terror, about the role of the New York branches and the Arlington County, Virginia Library. I just wanted to say a couple of words about the Army Library in the Pentagon.

I was a keynote speaker at the Army Library Institute this year, and one of the generals actually attended. He's the general in the part of the Army to which the library reports. He told the story of the fact that the Army library was in that part of the Pentagon that was hit. They lost most of the contents of that library, but all the library staff were in the library at the time, and the director of the library actually gathered the staff together and they literally crawled out on their bellies to come out of the library.

The director made sure that all the staff were there, that all the staff got out. And on the morning of September the 12th, they all reported back to work.

I think that in addition to these wonderful public services that the other libraries provided, that that also is deserving of recognition. So that is why I felt it important that we add the Army Library as well.

MS. GOULD: Is there any other discussion?

DR. MARTIN: What form should this award take?

DR. GRIFFITHS: You know, sort of a --

MS. GOULD: We could make a citation --

DR. GRIFFITHS: -- citation that they could --

MS. GOULD: -- and present it to them.

DR. MARTIN: Just a question for clarification: From the way you worded your motion, you said to "create an outstanding leadership award." Is this something that --

DR. GRIFFITHS: For the specific purpose of --

DR. MARTIN: For this instance only. Not for something that would be --

DR. GRIFFITHS: That's correct, for this instance only.

MR. WILLARD: The Commission has a history of offering awards for different occasions.

DR. GRIFFITHS: And it really is not going to be an award. It will be a special citation.

MS. GOULD: Is there any other discussion?

[No response.]

MS. GOULD: All those in favor.

[A chorus of ayes.]

MS. GOULD: Opposed?

[No response.]

MS. GOULD: So carried.

DR. GRIFFITHS: We'll work up some text, based on your memo and other information, and circulate it.

DR. CHALLINOR: You can also have it very, very nicely done. We can get a calligrapher who -- there are calligraphers around who do that kind of work.

MS. GOULD: Okay. Bob, you are on.

MR. WILLARD: A couple of things before I jump into my report: First of all, as I indicated a number of times in the past, I have a great fascination with the history of this

organization, and because of our budget battles, I have been driven to understand it and explore it even more than I might under normal circumstances.

I have said on a number of occasions, and I have said it to Toni Carbo, that when I'm going through the files and I find an example of something very well done, it is usually during the period she was executive director. She served here from 1980 to I guess about 1986, at which time she left here and went to the University of Pittsburgh.

This evening it is a matter of some regret to me that I will be here rather than in Pittsburgh, because they are going to have a celebration as she leaves her role as dean, but continues to serve the university there in a professorial position, although with an interim assignment here in Washington, where she will be working at the Library of Congress.

So I would strongly recommend to the members of the Commission that we take a moment to recognize Toni's past contributions to the Commission, her continuing contributions to the University of Pittsburgh, and offer our congratulations on her career transition. Woody will, in fact, be attending her celebration this evening, and could carry that message, if it is the will of this body. Woody is also passing a picture around, which we are not going to identify who the people are --

MS. GOULD: I know who they are.

MR. WILLARD: -- except to say that Bessie Moore is in the background.

MS. GOULD: What I would prefer to do is to request that Woody do carry our congratulations and recognition to Toni Carbo, but that we also do a formal resolution which would be given to her at a later date. So with that, I would entertain the motion.

MS. BINGHAM: I so move.

MS. GOULD: Rebecca Bingham has moved.

DR. GRIFFITHS: Second it.

MS. GOULD: José-Marie Griffiths has seconded it.

Is there any further discussion?

[No response.]

MS. GOULD: All those in favor.

[A chorus of ayes.]

MS. GOULD: Opposed?

[No response.]

MS. GOULD: So carried.

MR. WILLARD: Now, the second item, before we get to the formal report is on a more personal level. I have been noticing some health problems I have experienced myself, a slight shortness of breath, so I had a recent echocardiogram. It's one of those things where they put the little -- the same thing they use for pregnancy evaluation. So immediately when they put the thing on, I was looking at the screen, and I said, "Is it a boy or a girl?" I imagine they probably heard that before.

[Laughter.]

MR. WILLARD: It turned out it wasn't either, but it was something that started with a "B." There is a blockage. So I am going in on Tuesday for a cardiac catheterization, which could result in one of three things: Either they can do the treatment by medicine, or angioplasty right away, which would mean an overnight stay in the hospital, or there is potential for open heart by-pass. So we will know on Tuesday. But that will sort of take me out of the game for just a little while. The funny thing is, I had planned to take off next week, but not for medical reasons.

MS. GOULD: Those things happen.

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

PARTICIPANT: I hope Judy will keep us informed.

DR. GRIFFITHS: Absolutely.

MS. GOULD: Definitely.

I have to say this has been an interesting year for the National Commission in more ways than one. Having just come back from China, I am reminded of the proverb, "May you live in interesting times."

With that, Mr. Willard, would you please give us your executive director's report?

MR. WILLARD: By the way -- I will do that. There are all sorts of causality factors you could look at. It could be -- I've got a genetic predisposition, you wouldn't believe on coronary issues. My diet hasn't been great. I haven't been doing too much exercise. But as far as I'm concerned, it's because of the stress caused by OMB.

[Laughter.]

MR. WILLARD: Some people say blame Canada. We say blame OMB.

MR. HIGHTOWER: There's a lawyer somewhere that would take your case.

MS. GOULD: But not in this room.

[Laughter.]

MR. WILLARD: These slides may look a little familiar. They are based on reports that I have given in the past in covering these topics. With regard to the appropriation, we are operating under the FY-2002 bill, which authorized \$1 million for us instead of the \$1.5 million that we had operated on the year before.

I also want to talk to you a little bit about the 2003 bill, where that is, and also, with the implications of the LSTA reauthorization on the future of the Commission.

As you remember, the Conference Committee provided us \$1 million. There was no explanation in the report language of why they picked that number. Before the report, the two separate Houses had issued reports, one of which was the House authorizing \$1 million, and saying that we should go out of business, we should wrap up our continuing activities. The Senate gave us \$1.5 million, and criticized the OMB for zeroing us out.

When the Conference Committee came together, they picked the House amount, but they didn't say why. We have taken comfort in the fact that they did say specifically about other agencies, they were terminating them. So there is no indication in that language that there was anything other than they just didn't have enough money to -- we didn't have someone speaking up loudly for us at the eleventh hour of the conference work.

Obviously, we are at two-thirds of what we had been the year before. How we have dealt with that, fortunately, our running rate for the first quarter of the year -- we didn't know what our appropriation would be until December of last year, so the first quarter of the year was up. But fortunately, we had kept our running rate low, and we were able to cover a fair amount of first quarter expenses out of legally transferred money from a prior year. But once we knew where we were, we put a hold on all discretionary purchases. We had to do a staff reduction, I'll talk about a little bit more.

We do have furloughs planned. In figuring out what it needed to be, it looked like if we would get about two weeks of me and about three days of the entire office, that that would be sufficient for the other activities we had to be able to hit our target of \$1 million.

What makes it extremely difficult to deal with this is: The financial information that we are getting out of the Department of Education, who was our administer of support, has just been horrible. I mean there is no other word for it. They keep forgetting about the fact that there are remote users of their system. And when they do a change, which it seems they do every other month, or sometimes every other week, then a few

days later when something isn't working, and they say, "Oh, we forgot about the remote users."

So consequently, we will have some discussion about where we are financially in this meeting today, but I don't give it a lot of credence, because the numbers are just so hard -- I've said to Judy many times, I have a better control of my household expenses using Quicken than this federal agency does using the tools of the federal government.

Let's talk about the bill that is before Congress right now. You know the same thing has happened. The Administration has set up a budget that has us zeroed out again. There isn't a lot of attention on the full appropriation, because they had been dealing with the supplemental. It is quite conceivable that that supplemental won't even make it through. There is still a lot of discussion on whether, because we are getting so close to the end of the fiscal year anyhow, and there are some major points of disagreement between various factors in both sides of the Congress, but it is difficult to gather much attention from appropriators on the fiscal year 2003 bill while they are still looking at the supplemental.

There is a very strong possibility that there will be a lame duck session. We are hearing that more on the House side than the Senate. The Senate has kept a stiff upper lip and saying, "Yes, we can get it done," but --

MS. RUSSELL: Not without their partners.

MR. WILLARD: -- it looks to me, if I were betting personally, I would say that on October 1st of this year there will be a continuing resolution in place, and that is unfortunately bad news for us, because it continues most likely at the \$1 million we are at this year.

After the elections, the current Congress will come back for a lame duck session, and they will finally pass all the appropriations. Ours, of course, will be the last one passed, or the second-to-the-last one passed.

The House does parcel out allocations for each of the 13 appropriations committees, and the allocation for the Labor H Committee -- Labor and HHS, and Education, is equivalent to what was in the President's request, which is \$129 billion. So we are looking for our \$3 million out of that \$129 billion.

I would say we have gotten strong indications of support from leaders on both sides. You never know until the final moment how it is going to turn out, but we had a wonderful hearing that Martha and Jack testified at. We still enjoy the support of the Majority Whip in the Senate. He's personally supportive of us, and has assigned a staff person to work very closely with us.

I apologize to my alma mater, the Information Industry. The next slide should say, "Support from the Library Committee and Information Industry," because we have gotten

indications of support explicitly in letters, and in visits on the Hill, unlike last year, where we intentionally did not ask for it. This year, we are getting letters -- postcards and letters are going to Congress indicating that other communities see the need for the continuation of the Commission.

There is very good news in the Museum of Library Services Act Reauthorization. Some of us were a little concerned when we read it. And I have to confess that I was very pleased to receive a heads up from Bob Martin that the advisory mechanism for IMLS was going to be changed in the legislation. Some people interpreted that, because it does away with the assignment of the Commission as a formal advisor to the director of IMLS, and Major Owens saw that as very serious, and he tried to get an amendment during the markup process to do away with that.

It really doesn't concern us very much, for two reasons. One, we support the IMLS in their desire to have a more streamlined administratively manageable advisory mechanism, and the overarching law that established this Commission allows the Commission to provide advice to anybody it wants, including, and most especially, to the director of IMLS. So when the report language came out of the House, I was pleased to read what I quoted there, that the committee does not intend to eliminate IMLS. They said that explicitly.

Even better is what happened over on the Senate side. When the Senate introduced their version, which is very, very close -- later on in the discussion, if it is the wish, I'm sure we can get into more detail on the substantive aspect of the reauthorization, but as far as the little procedural provisions that pertain to the Commission, there are a couple of things.

First of all, the chairperson is named as a member of the new streamlined advisory body, and secondly, there are a couple of amendments to our own statute that we asked them for. We asked them for four things. We discussed this at the last meeting, but they gave us three, and that's pretty good.

The first is just a slight modification to our gift account authority, which explicitly allows us to solicit. We had the ability to receive, but it didn't say we could ask for it. Now that this Senate bill is passed, it will say we can ask for gift account -- gift to be commissioned.

Secondly, it redefines the quorum. You know under a legal opinion we got in the seventies that a quorum is defined as a majority of the commissioners that are authorized. In other words, it would be eight people. The new language would say it would be a majority of those who are in office. And with regard to "office," it does explicitly say that commissioners will serve until their replacement is appointed and takes office.

Well, the reason that is important is: We now have active legislation on the floor of the -- or on its way to the floor of the Senate that says a commission exists and we still want it around, because we are fine-tuning it.

I am very pleased that -- in fact, it's funny. I knew the bill had been introduced. I was on travel for the SLA and ALA meetings, and I had gone to bed, and all of a sudden I remembered, "I haven't read that bill yet," and I got up and I fired up my computer, and it was about 1:00 o'clock in the morning, and I was so happy to see those particular provisions in the bill.

With regard to personnel, we have had some changes in the permanent staff, and I'm also going to talk about commissioner appointments. With regard to the permanent staff, we had to let Rosalie go at the beginning of April. We also, with great regret, had to cut Woody back another 50 percent, so he's down to 12 hours a week, and focusing exclusively on international information issues.

I can't tell you how often there is a topic that comes up in government information that I want to go running down that hall to talk to Woody about. We have a temporary who is serving as receptionist, and she works from 10:00 to 2:00 each day.

This is a chart you've seen before, but I think it's an easy way to work through what the membership of the Commission is. When we met out in Cincinnati, this was the composition of the Commission. We had only two vacancies that resulted, Jean's death and Frank's expiration of his term, but we also had Abe, and Walter, and LaVar in their one-year extension period.

On July 20th, with Abe, and Walter, and LaVar, we are now down to five vacancies, but three of our appointees, Robinson, Hollohan, and Mason, were all recess appointees, so at the end of the Senate session, they also were gone.

That is a picture of the Commission right now. We have seven members, two of whom their terms formally expired in July of last year, and will, in fact, definitely expire on July 19th of this year. At that point, we will be down to five members.

The White House continues to take the position that until they know that the Commission is continued, that is, it's funded, they are not going to make appointments. However, we have been working with a number of people who indicated an interest in being appointed, and they are continuing to put pressure on the Office of White House Personnel to get themselves appointed.

I have had one contact with the White House Personnel Office, just the person identified himself, and said, when -- my words, not his, when the logjam breaks, he's the person we will be dealing with.

Just a reminder, the legislation, even if the legislation, by the way, were to pass today -- and it won't -- it has an effective date of October 1, 2002, so there is nothing that can be done to do anything about the two appointments that -- other than a miracle -- the two appointments that expire next month. There's no way the legislation is going to make it through in three weeks, or two weeks.

It just continues to -- if we were at full staff, this would be a bothersome situation. When we are as understaffed as we are, this -- even something, the third point, travel support, they've implemented a new Web-based travel system, so we can fill out -- and theoretically, every commissioner that travels could get on the Web and could do their own reports. We're not going to let you. You will enter a number, and then you will hit the enter key, or click on the "okay" key, and then you sit there and wait 45 seconds until the next page shows up.

This is one I don't really want to get into, but I have to. The annual report remains incomplete. Rosalie left me a draft that I would characterize as about ninety percent there, but that last ten percent requires some work, and there is always, it seems, one thing that comes ahead of it. It is by law, and the law says, the Commission will have an annual report by January 31st of the year following the fiscal year.

I haven't done an exhaustive study of this, but it says that about a lot of agencies and a lot of agencies get the memo, and they can. They are still making no promises, because I think Martha agrees that when you have a real live project that needs something by a certain day, for example, getting the testimony prepared for the appropriations hearing, the annual report becomes second priority, but it will get done.

The school's library hearing is sort of in that same circumstance, except we have made some major steps forward since the last time. Thanks to the work of Rebecca Bingham, we have the beginnings of an introductory section for that. We have an outside editor, who has passed along to us the full hearing record that is now benefited from a single pair of eyes going through and looking at it for consistency, and so on. I confess, I have not read that myself yet, and I feel that I have to before the Commission's name goes on it, but we are close on that one.

We were able to use the information from that to put together a two-page sort of manifesto, or summary, that Rebecca did, in fact, hand-carry to the White House Conference on School Libraries, which she attended. I am hopeful we will have an opportunity to learn a little bit more about it in the meeting.

MS. RUSSELL: It's in the folders. It was sent out to the Commissioners --

MR. WILLARD: Yes, it was sent out.

MS. RUSSELL: -- but it's also in their folders.

MR. WILLARD: Finally, Trust and Terror, I will say more about this, but we are moving along on that, and that's the post-9/11 briefing. Where it is now is, we have a fully developed PowerPoint presentation that has a narration written, but not recorded.

I am happy to say that, you may remember that at our last meeting we made a quick call to see whether a very famous newscaster, anchorman, retired, would be able to

do the narration, and we got very positive feedback that he could, but there was a scheduling problem, and now the earliest that it looks like he would be available would be September. Mid-July, there is a very small probability, but more likely September.

I have been in contact with a friend of mine who runs a radio station on Cape Cod, and is an on-air personality, and has a very good voice, and he has agreed to do the narration. It will be recorded this evening, and Fed Ex'd to us.

So the next step then is the production of linking the narration electronically with the PowerPoint slides, but I think we can handle that. If we can't figure out how to do it ourselves, we can hire the expertise quickly.

We also put together, thanks to drafting efforts by Martha, and then polishing efforts by Judy, a brochure, and that also is in your folder, still with the draft indicia on it, but it is a -- it actually works out to be a very good stand-alone project. The idea was that it would accompany the PowerPoint presentation, and after somebody had seen it, you'd give them the brochure, but I've discovered that the brochure stands alone, and you can also use it as a tool to communicate the concept of the idea.

We also have been invited, and invited is a -- let's say we've engineered an invitation to do a presentation on the Trust and Terror idea at IPLA in Glasgow this August. Joan will do that, and thanks to her contribution, we will also have copies of the brochure in both French and Spanish to distribute at the time of the presentation.

DR. GRIFFITHS: When are you going to have a final version that doesn't have "draft" on it?

MS. RUSSELL: When we have the main speaker.

DR. GRIFFITHS: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: We'll probably do the interim ones for IPLA, and just not mention who the narrator is, but just the presentation.

MR. WILLARD: Bob Seay is the head of WOMR Public Radio, Community Radio, in Provincetown, Massachusetts, and he is going to be the announcer, but he understands or will understand that if we get this prominent announcer in September that Bob will gracefully step aside.

DR. CHALLINOR: But I'm going to be doing the narration at IPLA, because --

MR. WILLARD: You're doing the French.

DR. CHALLINOR: No. The Spanish. But other than the Spanish, we have a shorter version that I will probably take, because some of that is so old, and so specific to America. José and I have a shorter version.

MR. WILLARD: We still have an opportunity to meet with Administration representatives who have developed, thanks to José's efforts, a one-pager describing the whole Trust and Terror concept.

I have not been as aggressive with setting up an appointment with the Administration. And now that their attention is so, let's say, focused like a laser beam on the Cabinet level reauthorization, or Cabinet establishment, we still -- we need to get in there. We need to get a message to them, and I think during the discussion period, the Commission may want to address that issue a little bit more head on.

This is just a reminder that in addition to the Trust and Terror presentation, we also have on our agenda the desire to do something about library services for individuals with disabilities, but until our funding is clarified, that's a wish list rather than anything we are working on actively.

Let me say a few things about these project areas. And again, we will have more time to discuss them. But the government information, we have really pulled back for two reasons. One, our own budgetary problems, but also the fact that the focus on the Hill is just not where it should be if we wanted to grab attention. Our comprehensive assessment report is in the hands of many decision makers on the Hill, but we're not doing much with it.

The E-government initiative, S-803, the hearing report came out on that, and did include the summary from our comprehensive assessment. The report itself on the Bill -- the Bill has been significantly modified, and reported out of the Senate committee. A report has been written and filed, but is not yet available, so I haven't seen it. So I don't know to what extent they are talking about our issues, but again, it is below the line in terms of the things we are working on.

I wanted to add in this area, though, the information to the Commission about the nomination of the new public printer. Bruce James is a retired legal publisher, whose career started actually in hands-on ink printing. He can show you scars from hot lead line-of-type typesetting. Equally important, he is from the great State of Nevada, and a friend of mine for many years.

I was just absolutely pleased when it was announced that he would be the President's nominee. The nomination has not gone forward yet. It is expected any day now. They are doing some of that last-minute -- well, all of you having dealt with Presidential personnel know about the -- and the Office of Legal Counsel in the White House, know what it's like to get your nomination finally set up.

It goes up to a committee that has the authority for only one Presidential appointment. It's the Senate Rules Committee, and the public printer is the only nomination they deal with, and they haven't dealt with one in about eight years now, but

we are hoping that they will, therefore, be able to give it expedited treatment, but we don't know.

Bruce has indicated that he sees -- by the way, I have provided him an in-depth collection of the Commission's work in the government information area. He has all of our reports. I talked to him yesterday, and I think this is indicative of the type of reaction you want from a senior manager, a senior executive. He said, "Thank you for sending that material. I looked at it. I have someone reading it now to tell me what I should know from it."

That's the way he plans to work at the -- he believes very strongly that much needs to be done to improve the Government Printing Office, and that his responsibility is to be the outside person to deal with policymakers and people of influence, and he is the sort of person who can do that.

He came to Washington a month or so back, and made partial rounds. He purposefully couldn't meet everybody he should before -- because he isn't formally nominated yet, but he had very good meetings with the library community and others.

Library statistics continues to be -- well, let me just tell you about being at the COSLA meeting in Atlanta. Barrett Wilkins, who is the head of their research and statistics effort within COSLA, praised to the ceiling Denise Davis, said that it was in the vital interest of COSLA to make sure that a statistics program in the library field continued, and strongly supported it.

Denise has just recently been asked to give a course at Syracuse University, a weekend course, so -- which she travels to Syracuse, what, every other week?

MS. DAVIS: Every three weekends, every third.

MR. WILLARD: The network performance measures is, I think, one of the most complex and difficult to understand, and important activities we have going on. That really refers to: How do you evaluate the use that individuals get out of going into a library and using electronic resources? It boggles the mind, but we -- if nothing else, we have to have standards, so that at least when one institution talks about it, they're talking about it in the same language as other institutions, and that is one of the things that we approved, and the statistics program can do.

Continue to deal with NCES. Administerial function, we still have not received the transfer of funds for -- we receive an amount of money from the Department of Education to run the statistics program, and that has not come in yet, but it's only June. It should have been here in October, but we have a very strong relationship now.

We've always been an institutional member, but in many years past, it has been more lip service than -- standards would come in, and I would sort of look at them and

say, "Oh, okay. I guess that's okay." Now, Denise is very much an active participant, and, of course, José is also on the board.

We continue to reach out to other library institutions around the world, and specifically the European Union has put a lot of effort into library statistics.

I guess you are going to another meeting coming up in the fall.

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. WILLARD: Also in the international area, sister libraries, we are not doing much on that, but as Joan has made it abundantly clear, if you want to go back to people for support, you better be able to tell them what their prior support has contributed. We are further along in this than we were able to report last time.

Because of the leadership work of Dr. Forest "Woody" Horton back in the late seventies, you cannot get a survey sent out to the world unless OMB approves it first.

MS. GOULD: Thank you, Woody.

[Laughter.]

MR. WILLARD: He was the research director for the wonderfully named Commission on Federal Paperwork. We have gotten their permission, and -- what was the estimate of the hours? It was 200 hours, or something.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. It was pitiful.

MR. WILLARD: They refer to the paperwork burden. The paperwork burden is measured by how much time respondents will have to use in complying with your request for information to them. So, for example, when they send out the IRS Form 1040, they estimate that the paperwork burden is about, I'd say, 500 -- no, about a billion hours of response time, when you measure all the people who have to fill it out, and the time --

DR. GRIFFITHS: And they probably underestimate it substantially.

MR. WILLARD: So we have 200 hours of that total, which is something like 40 billion that the federal government is managing.

We also are using electronic techniques in the survey. We are allowing the libraries -- we are asking the libraries, both in the United States and overseas that paired, to fill out this questionnaire, and those that can, we are asking them to do it on-line.

It is our hope, but I cannot report any progress on transitioning the program to another organization. I think UNESCO has stayed in touch with us, and wants to see the results of our survey, but we have not had too much continuing conversation on that.

THE SECA funds, which are the funds that we received from the State Department to cover Scientific Educational and Cultural Activities in the information area, that would normally be done through UNESCO, if we were members of UNESCO, there has been a transition in the leadership of that program within the State Department. Someone who had been in charge of it for 20 years retired.

A new person is very low on the learning curve right now, and we have not received any indication of how much, if any, money we will get. We have made the commitment, and warned other people who traditionally have received contributions through the Commission that there is no likelihood of receiving contributions this time, unless, again, a miracle happens. If I were betting, again, I would say we would probably get about \$75,000 to \$100,000, and that is earmarked for the next point, the International Leadership Conference and Information Agency.

That, as I reported in the past, is the partnership activity we are doing with UNESCO international quorum. The long-term objective is the conference in 2003 with worldwide participation, probably in the neighborhood of 500 to 1,000 participants from throughout the world, but with a special emphasis on developing countries, and to explore the role of information literacy in that development.

Last October, we hosted a meeting, and I believe Joan was at it. It brought together about ten or twelve people who set the agenda for the next step. We also started a fund-raising activity. The effort to get money from within the government, the U.S. government, has not been successful. Education has turned us down. USAID has turned us down. State is there, because of the SECA funds. So we just don't know on that yet.

However, we are also reaching out to foundations. We sent out a number of appeals, about a dozen or so, in December. We did not get a very good response to them. Some said it was out of their area of their support. Others said it was too late. Some at least held out the possibility for further conversation. But a couple of foundations, I believe AOL-Time Warner is one of them, and Bertlesman is the other, we still have very good possibilities.

We also have an application into The World Bank that a decision will be made next month. The type of meeting we have is exactly on target with the type of activities that The World Bank program that we are dealing with wants to support. Again, Woody is here, and we can get into more details on any of this after I'm finished.

The next step originally was going to be an experts' meeting with about 30 people in Prague in April. We did have to defer that; however, we are still hopeful for early winter this year. It, of course, is dependent on the prior point. If we get the money, we move forward. If we don't, we don't go to the experts' meeting. However, in the interim, we have proceeded with the invited papers.

The concept was that each of the people who would be at the experts' meeting, as part of their price of admission, they would contribute to the intellectual capital on the topic of information literacy.

We are moving forward on that. We have agreed to give a truly minuscule honorarium to each of the authors. I see Woody is pointing to the set of papers that we have received so far. It is our intention to do some editorial harmonization, so that they don't look like they are all part of the same family, and electronically publish them on our Website as soon as we possibly can.

In turn, we are also in negotiations with UNESCO on a hard-copy publication that would be co-sponsored by the Commission, UNESCO, and the national forum, and most likely that would take the form of a report of the proceedings of the board of experts, with the invited papers as appendices. There is a slight intellectual property issue at hand, and I think we have come to closure on it.

Every one of the papers, because they have received -- the authors have received an honorarium from the Commission for doing it, are considered works of the government, and, therefore, are not copyrightable, and people can do with them whatever they want. UNESCO likes to put a copyright on its publications, so the proceedings will probably be copyrighted, but it will be the uncopyrighted appendix that has the papers.

I will ask Woody that when he gets a chance, after I am finished, to just give a general comment on the quality of the papers that we have received.

I want to talk just a few minutes about unfulfilled opportunities. There are things that are happening all the time in this area that we really should be jumping on, and to the extent that we are under- resourced, we either don't or we don't do as good or as full a job as we could.

When we heard that the State Library in Washington was going to close, we didn't do a thing. Fortunately, that has somewhat resolved, although they are going through a second iteration of problems, with the governor just holding back on funds that have been earmarked for that library, but at least the library continues. It has been moved into the Office of the Secretary of State, which is not an inhospitable place for state libraries to be. As Bob could tell you, there are a number of them that are organized that way.

Most recently, the State of Minnesota took action to cut back its expenditures in the Department of Children, Families, and Learning, a 25-percent cut across the board, but when they started parceling that out, a more than fair share, a disproportionate share of the cuts were focused on the state library agency, and firings were announced in early May, or I guess June.

MS. DAVIS: The first wave we heard about in May.

MR. WILLARD: Well, the first wave was back in the beginning of the year, wasn't it, and then --

MS. DAVIS: Well, that was the collection, but staff weren't really let go until the spring, and then the second wave was in June.

MR. WILLARD: So it ended up with essentially three people working on traditional state library agencies. The Office talks about eleven people, but the other eight are the people who are running the library for the handicapped, for the blind and the handicapped. So the staff that is doing traditional state library activities is down to three, and they are people who are not long-term in their jobs.

We did send a letter. Martha sent a letter to the head of the Department of Children, Families, and Family Learning, and we have not received a reaction directly from them, although we've heard a little bit about their suggestion that maybe we could provide them the wisdom that they didn't have.

MS. GOULD: I also requested that he send my letter to the members of the Minnesota State legislature that handled budgets, the appropriations and finance committees.

MR. WILLARD: I think this is something that is on the agenda for this afternoon, for the joint meeting, but it raises significant questions for the whole area of federal aid to states, and what are the responsibilities they have incurred in order to get this federal aid. It is an area that, if we were better staffed right now, I would recommend to the Commission that we jump in with both feet.

Another area we talked about -- in fact, the "talking about" is what I want to mention. The executive order that came out, access to Presidential papers, if you just build the scenario for a while, if the budget situation hadn't been what it was, if the new administration came in and OMB had just put us forward at our regular level, and the Office of Presidential Personnel had made appointments, because they had lots of people who wanted to be on it, the composition around this table would be significant -- would be different. I won't say how significant, but it would be different than it is right now.

I still believe that no matter what the composition of this table was, when people who carry the responsibility for looking out for the information needs of the American people, look at that executive order, they would raise some questions.

Some may say, "I can understand the President would want to do this, but I don't think he should do that," and I think this Commission could have crafted a very good policy recommendation to send back to The White House and say, "This is what we think about the executive order. Here's what is good about it, here's what is bad about it, and here's what we recommend you do."

We didn't do that, and specifically we didn't do that, because of two things. We don't have the bandwidth to handle it, but there also was a remark mentioned at the Commission meeting, I guess it was in December, when this thing came out, that given our budget -- given our situation, given the fact that The White House doesn't like us, quote, unquote, we shouldn't be taking a position. That is exactly the opposite of what the situation should be.

This was set up to be an independent voice of the people, and it shows what troublesome developments come out of a budgetary recommendation like we are living with. We shouldn't have to step back from taking a position on a controversial issue because we are concerned about the political ramifications of it. We should just be able to look at it because of the four corners of the matter itself.

So it's under the unfulfilled opportunities. I can tell you that there is no hope of our getting involved in that in the near future, but it is an issue that I think The White House would have benefited well from the perspective that a group of citizens, however they are comprised -- we don't know what the composition of the new commission is, but however they are comprised, I think it would have added a richness to that discussion, but is missing.

Another issue just showed up in the papers this week. The FBI is looking at the library records of individuals suspected of being terrorists. It is done through the legal process. There is no question about that. Warrants are issued. Warrants are issued in non-public court proceedings, but nonetheless, legal warrants are issued.

I don't want to jump to any conclusion about where I think the Commission would come out on that, as we do know that as the political coloration of the Commission changes over time, and that is always one of the benefits of a commission that allows a turnover as a new administration comes in, the new commission isn't instantly the new administration. They still keep some from the prior administration, and starts adding, and I think that mix is good, because it sort of adds a time delay to changes in political orientation.

But whatever the composition of this Commission is, given its mission of representing the needs of the American people as users of information, it could add to that discussion, which we are not doing.

The last thing is something that I introduced at the Commission meeting I guess last September or so, and pointed out that August 2nd will be the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Bessie Moore. Now, there is some members of the Commission who never knew Bessie, but those who do, and those who read her biography, know that probably in the history of this organization, there is no other person -- she has to be at the pinnacle, even though she was never chair, and she was vice-chair for 18 years, probably the -- she was at the pinnacle of leadership and contribution in this organization. Of course, she was 67 when she was first appointed to the Commission, and stayed until she was 77, almost in her eighties, I guess.

I had sketched out and talked to Martha about the idea of having a Commission meeting on August 1st in New York City. Both Hilary and President Clinton were very close to Bessie, and would want to be part of any celebration of the activities of her life. In fact, I did correspond with the President, and he wanted very much to be kept apprised of any planning that we did in this area.

So I thought it would really be a great opportunity to do two things. One is to look back and say, "Here is an individual who was involved, not only in the first 18 years of the Commission's life, but also in the life of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries that LBJ appointed, and which suggested the permanent IMLS," and then to look forward, because I think you could say when you look at both the National Advisory Commission that Doug Knight shared and the early days of the Commission, there was a broader, more strategic view that the members had then than we currently have.

I don't say that to be critical in any way. I think the less strategic, more tactical projects that we have been involved in recently, like Kids on the Internet, like Trust and Terror, like the hearings we have had on school libraries and individuals with disabilities, those are all wonderful contributions, and we should take pride in them. But what the law says is that we should be involved in looking at overall planning to the library and information needs of the country.

So I saw the opportunity on August 2nd to not only say, "Here's what we have done," but "Here is what we should be doing. Here is how we would replicate the early days of the Commission, the work of the Knight Commission for the 21st Century."

Unfortunately, we can't do it. I just -- I would rather not do something poorly, so I think we have to pull back on that.

I think we should keep that in mind. I think we really need, once our financial situation is clarified, and we move forward, I think we need to have some sort of broad, strategic initiative that leads the Commission into this century; however, we don't want to let the calendar escape us.

So with your permission, I want to do a couple of things between now and August 2nd. And I want, for example, to be in touch with the Governor of Arkansas, and ask him to issue some sort of proclamation recognizing Bessie. I want to be in touch with Senator Clinton, and make sure that on the floor of the Senate, at the appropriate time, a tribute to her is made. I want to see similarly on the House side an appropriate recognition. It could be a combination of either the Arkansas delegation, or someone like --

MS. GOULD: I missed the last one.

MR. WILLARD: On the House side, the House of Representatives, I want to have some sort of --

MS. GOULD: But wouldn't that be Major Owen?

MR. WILLARD: Well, yes. The Arkansas delegation would probably have the first with Major Owen certainly, and he knew her well. He would be a very articulate and feeling spokesperson for that.

But then let us hope that, using the old technique of centennial years, we can recognize from August 2nd of 2002 to August 1st of 2003 that there may be occasions for the Commission to do something more formal, at a hearing, or -- not a hearing, but a celebratory meeting could be had somewhere in the future. I wish it could be August 2nd, and, in fact, I even made reservations. There is a wonderful hotel in New York called the Library Hotel. Each floor is devoted to a different element within the Dewey Decimal System, and we have a block of rooms there, but I think I will have to let them go, because I just don't see there is a way to pull it off between now and then.

DR. CHALLINOR: I would wish that if you did this again that you would let us know, because I am going to be at the opposite end of the country on August 2nd. For heaven's sake, let us know sooner than -- what is today, June 27th. Let us know way, way, way ahead of time.

MR. WILLARD: You'll see, this is a slide that I closed with last time. I've changed only one thing. I added the "S." This budget battle has certainly changed the nature of the work around here, but you do what you have to do. We aren't doing things to the degree of perfectionism that I would like to be doing, but we are getting things done. I think our motto continues to be "Keep on keeping on."

MS. GOULD: I would like to comment here that the staff had worked under somewhat stressful conditions, which would be the understatement of the year. And I would like to commend the staff for their professionalism and their commitment. It is not easy to work under these conditions, and I think they have really done herculean duty.

MR. WILLARD: I think one person deserves special recognition. I have worked with Judy in three different situations for, I guess, going on almost 25 years now. It is important to be able to have the sort of job I do, and to have these big strategic things, but it is almost important to make sure that there will be fruit at the meeting, that the coffee will be available, and Judy --

MS. RUSSELL: And the bills get paid.

MR. WILLARD: -- never fails to jump in there and make sure all the nitty-gritty gets done, the payroll gets done, the processing with these horrible systems, financial systems that we deal with. She fights them. She's on the phone, trying to be as tactful as possible, but that doesn't always help.

While I could say good things about every single person on our staff, Judy deserves special recognition for her leadership.

DR. CHALLINOR: I would agree with that. I'm the person that is down here the most. I would agree with that.

MS. GOULD: Absolutely.

Dr. CHALLINOR: I would like to say something, if I may, about -- to go back to the fact that we can give advice to IMLS whenever we want.

I think it is in the nature of Bob Martin that this will work well, because he is so available and so open to us, and I want to pay tribute to that. It could be quite otherwise, and I feel very much that I could pick up the telephone any time and speak to Bob, and that's no small thing, and I'd like to pay tribute to that.

MS. GOULD: I agree, and I think by consensus, the Commission agrees.

Okay. We are now down to questions at this point. Any questions? Any comments?

MR. HIGHTOWER: Could you tell me about the -- let me comment about the Trust and Terror. I was sitting along beside Bob Willard and Judy as the events took place, and we were immediately aware of our duties, and responsibilities, and opportunities were going to be changed as a result of that moment.

So we were sitting there in Bob's office when the young lady came from another office and said, "Turn on the TV. A plane has hit the Trades Tower in New York." We turned it on, and we sat there several hours, I don't remember how long, but a long time, watching the events unfold.

MS. GOULD: It was, to paraphrase a former President, a day that will live in infamy.

MR. WILLARD: Actually, as you-all remember, we were planning to have a Commission meeting the next day, and, in fact, it was the joint meeting of the -- Martha was already in a plane.

DR. CHALLINOR: We were out on the taxiway, about to take off.

MR. HIGHTOWER: I think Bob and I were on the phone within about 15 minutes after the Pentagon, and we knew the world had changed.

MR. WILLARD: By the way, I don't know if anything has been said about it. The meeting here is a little bit light on logistics. We have not done a lot in terms of scheduling your activities, besides the meeting itself, but when we leave here, when we finish this meeting at 12:00, our next appearance is 2:00 o'clock at the Hotel Washington for the joint meeting.

You are on your own, is the bottom line. We are going to recommend that you go downstairs to the nearby cafeteria, get something there, bring it back. And at 12:30, we will show a videotape that ALA produced called "Lost and Recovery: Librarians Bear Witness to September 11, 2001." I saw about three minutes of it at the ALA meeting in Atlanta, and it was very impressive. It is firsthand stories of librarians who were on the scene in New York City. It is optional, but it will be shown on this big screen, Surround Sound -- no, we don't --

DR. CHALLINOR: I have another question, and that is, since our esteemed colleague Winston Tabb is going back in academia, will Jim Billington appoint somebody to take your place --

MR. TABB: Yes.

DR. CHALLINOR: -- to be with us --

MR. TABB: Yes.

DR. CHALLINOR: -- and would we have a voice in who we would like to see?

MR. TABB: He would always take your call, Joan --

DR. CHALLINOR: You are --

MR. TABB: -- or Martha.

[Laughter.]

DR. CHALLINOR: I mean I have somebody in mind. And would I speak to you, or would I call up Jim?

MR. TABB: Let's talk.

[Laughter.]

DR. CHALLINOR: Okay.

MS. GOULD: Any questions or need for further clarification on Bob's report?

DR. CHALLINOR: Yes. I want to ask about the SECA. How much of the SECA will take you to Glasgow?

MS. RUSSELL: If we get it, we typically use some part of it to fund --

DR. CHALLINOR: Yes, but my next question is, if we don't get it in time --

MR. WILLARD: We have travel funds.

DR. CHALLINOR: Oh, we still have travel funds in our budget?

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

MR. TABB: I'd like to ask about the IPLA presentation, in general. What is it? What is the venue?

DR. CHALLINOR: The venue is one of the -- there's a piece of paper floating around. I thought this up, that this is so good, I have received from all over, people to whom I have explained this, and showed it, think that it is absolutely -- so I thought, "Why not take it to IPLA?"

So then I wrote Mrs. Deschamps, and Mrs. Deschamps said to talk to somebody, Woody has all this, and then the person there says, "This is perfect. I would like you to make your presentation at this day's meeting," and I will show up with a new video, because it's going to be shortened, because much of our video, which is 40 pictures, has to do with the United States.

MR. TABB: We maybe don't need to take time on the -- on a particular section. The reason I'm asking is that ALA had asked permission to show this film and was denied, because they were coming so late to the program, and it was already very full, so I wasn't sure.

DR. CHALLINOR: Well, we have to thank Dwayne Webster, because Dwayne Webster gave a dinner party, you were there --

MR. TABB: Right.

DR. CHALLINOR: -- for Mrs. Deschamps, and Mrs. Deschamps and I spent about 45 minutes together. I'm just crazy about her. I think she is wonderful. I just wrote her a letter and said, "I would be awful thankful if you didn't say anything."

MS. RUSSELL: I don't remember now what the panel was, but it --

PARTICIPANT: I just want to make sure there is a slot, because this is not obvious.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, it's --

DR. CHALLINOR: I'm keeping a low profile. Thank you for the hint.

MR. WILLARD: I think it also is, we are dealing with a ten-minute presentation versus an hour of videotape, and we are a federal agency.

MS. GOULD: Interestingly enough, talking about Trust and Terror, Congressman Gibbons, who was my Congressman and a personal family friend, going back before he even ran for public office, is very interested in Trust and Terror. And even before we completed Trust and Terror, Jim and I talked about the role that libraries can play during times of disaster and emergency, and so I have a meeting with him tomorrow at noon in his office. We were supposed to meet yesterday, but he ended up stuck on the floor. That sounds interesting.

[Laughter.]

MS. GOULD: He was detained --

DR. MARTIN: By official business.

MS. GOULD: Yes. By official business on the floor of the House, but he is the President's point person in the House of Representatives, dealing with the new Cabinet agency, and so we will be bringing this to him. He is extremely interested in what we are doing in this arena, so I am very pleased with that.

DR. CHALLINOR: Then would we say that this rises to the -- are you talking about the presentation or the pamphlet?

MS. GOULD: I'm just talking about the pamphlet at this point. He knows that the presentation --

DR. CHALLINOR: And are we talking about this rising to the numero uno that ought to be done? Now, there is a Spanish version coming out, it will be done by tomorrow, so that maybe that Spanish version, which is more useful here than the French -- the French is to pay tribute to the French at IPLA, who can't -- you know, and there are an awful lot of Francophile countries in Africa, but the Spanish version might be extremely helpful here, and maybe that makes this rise to the top of the heap.

MS. GOULD: I can tell you better after I meet with Jim.

DR. CHALLINOR: Can you explain that?

MS. GOULD: We'll be ready to finish it with the name this week, right, because it's going to be taken tomorrow, so --

DR. CHALLINOR: So what are we talking about?

MS. GOULD: Then it's really ready.

DR. CHALLINOR: About time?

MS. GOULD: Yes, it will be ready.

DR. CHALLINOR: Will we out-source that? Should we out-source the pamphlet?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, I have an inquiry in to the Department of Ed, after all the Ed bashing we've done, to see if they will help us produce it in their facility, because they --

DR. CHALLINOR: And if they do, what is their time span?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, I haven't gotten a response from them, but when we have inquired about other things to do with them before, generally, the time isn't so much of an issue, as a matter of just getting it cleared through the authorization.

DR. CHALLINOR: But would we do better to out- source it?

MS. RUSSELL: If we need to do that, that's what we will do.

MR. WILLARD: We have to out-source it. We can't --

MS. RUSSELL: We can't do it here, so we'll either out-source it to them, or we'll out-source it to a contractor.

DR. CHALLINOR: Well, that is what I'm talking about.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

DR. CHALLINOR: Is time of the limit? Are we talking about something where time is of the essence?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, we have to go back and determine what exactly the IPLA presentation would like to do with this. Now, we talked about once we had the recording with our superstar, that we would press a CD, and we would try to make distribution to government officials, state government, libraries, and things like that.

I don't think we want to go to that expense, and do one distribution, and then follow it in September with a second distribution.

So what we need to determine is: What are the venues and what is the distribution? We could certainly put it up on our Website, although it's a very, very large file, and will become even larger once an audio track is - - more audio tracks are laid in, but I think we have to come kind of back to, "What is it that we want to do with it between now and September," as different from "What is it that we want to do once we have the final recording?"

DR. GRIFFITHS: But you are going to take this and the translated version --

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. We will print a limited number of copies in the three different languages to take and hand out at IPLA, and we certainly can have -- there is a place on the back to put a citation for a Website address, and we certainly can have a Website address for the presentation in each of the three languages, if we go to the point of recording it in each of the three languages, or just the English language, if that is all we have.

If we have to find somebody to actually -- we would have to translate the entire manuscript, the narrative, and then have it recorded, if we were going to do the French and Spanish for the whole PowerPoint presentation, as it --

DR. CHALLINOR: Well, we wouldn't want French. This country is English and Spanish. We wouldn't want French. I mean there are very few French speakers in the United States.

MS. RUSSELL: Well, I'm talking here about IPLA. If what we want to make available for IPLA is the brochure and also the presentation, or whether for IPLA we will have an English language presentation, and only the brochures and --

DR. CHALLINOR: Just the brochures and -- yes, because we are going to cut down. José and I are --

DR. GRIFFITHS: We'll do a shorter version of the presentation.

DR. CHALLINOR: -- cutting down the 40-page presentation.

MS. GOULD: In terms of my talking with Jim, this is just to follow-up with him, because he also sits on the select Intel committee -- it's just a follow-up, because he's very interested in terms of what libraries can do during emergencies and disasters, because we have incredible resources.

Many libraries have the same resources for their local communities that the New York Public Library has, and can be a source of information, and I think nationwide we saw a lot of people coming to libraries looking for information after 9/11. Jim is just very interested in the things that libraries can do to provide information, good information, to communities. What will happen -- it is sort of raising the visibility of the world that libraries can play in a community --

DR. CHALLINOR: Libraries as a network all around the country, I think is the thing that grabs people, that this network is in place, it would cost -- well, of course, everybody is spending billions these days, but it would cost billions to replace, and it's an in-place network.

MS. GOULD: So that's one of the reasons that I'm meeting with him on Friday, and --

DR. CHALLINOR: Yes, but I'm not sure --

MS. GOULD: It's just information sharing at this point with Jim.

DR. CHALLINOR: That, I understand. I'm interested in the fact that on August 15th I am going to leave with some pamphlets, and whether this rises to the numero uno level of what we ought to be doing at the moment. That's what I --

MS. GOULD: I think at this time, we are still in a holding pattern as to whether this is numero uno. It's one of the top priorities we have.

DR. CHALLINOR: And the other ones?

MS. GOULD: The annual report was one. The school library is -- the school library's hearing was number one. I think number two was Trust and Terror.

MS. RUSSELL: There are two possible opportunities for the Commission to testify before Congress coming up. One of them is the possibility that we will be invited to testify in July, if that date holds. July 10th is the tentative date. On the OMB memorandum announcing the intention to direct agencies that they are not required to follow the law as to -- through GPO or --

PARTICIPANT: Let's do something unique.

MS. RUSSELL: -- right -- which might be an opportunity for us to showcase our positions on government information, and how that ties to that, and then we may also have an opportunity in the confirmation of the public printer to at least provide a written testimony.

MR. TABB: Could I ask about that? Just specifically, you have spoken to this person, I have been hearing rumors that he was no longer interested. I gather that is not the case now. This OMB circular has no impact upon his interest in taking this position.

MS. RUSSELL: It's going to make his job more challenging.

MR. WILLARD: It was interesting when I called him and told him about that rumor, he said, "No truth to it, and if there had been, you would have been one of the first to hear." He called me within two or three hours after he knew he was going to be appointed.

MS. RUSSELL: And then he called me.

MR. TABB: As sort of a more practical matter to me, if you could educate me about -- since we are getting ready to become a quorumless Commission --

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

MR. TABB: -- I mean after this meeting, essentially -- are we already there? Until you get some change in the language about a quorum, I'm not sure what function we even serve. I mean --

MS. GOULD: We pass that on.

MR. TABB: So tell me what happens to the, in terms of meetings, or what's the point, since you have no quorum?

MS. GOULD: When we had a quorum, they authorized the executive committee to handle any business on behalf of the Commission --

MR. TABB: Okay.

MS. GOULD: -- and so the executive committee probably will end up being the committee of the whole, because once José is no longer with us on the executive committee, and we're going to be losing Rebecca, the executive committee will become the committee of the whole.

DR. ROBERTS: I think if you really want to put your finger on it, I've said it many times, the Commission -- it's pretty difficult for the Commission to charge out into new policy areas, and to have any political "umph" behind it, but I think the fact of the matter is that the Commission, even without funding, exists, and has the authority -- I hate to say it -- but has the authority to receive money to continue it.

So you could go to the Heritage Foundation, or to Microsoft, or to IBM, or someone, and say, "Give us some money so we can keep operating," but that isn't how you develop public policy. You should really be receiving public funds to do representation of the public policy.

I think it's a transitory problem. I do clearly believe that by the end of this year, the budget battles will be behind us. I'm less sanguine about the whole -- that the OMB will relent. I think we may have to go through it again, but I think we'll go through it at a much higher comfort level, because I believe that the Commission will be funded, not only to continue as we are now, but to expand.

I think the arguments that we made, or we said that "As long as we are talking -- as long as we've got your attention, Congress, here's what we really need." The \$2.8 million that we are seeking is a defensible, logical place for us to be, and we are getting indications in our contacts with staff that they are agreeing.

MR. WILLARD: Can't you -- you know, we just want to kill off the agency, don't change the current quorum. If you just don't appoint anybody, the appropriation doesn't

matter. I mean we basically are left with Winston's successor as our only -- that your successor will be the one man -- a one-person commission.

PARTICIPANT: The only voting member.

MR. TABB: Well, actually, that's the --

PARTICIPANT: Well, no. Bob Martin is, too.

MR. WILLARD: It doesn't seem to me that that's the one -- okay, two. It's going to be an odd commission if that's --

MR. HIGHTOWER: Well, some people -- you're 2004, right?

MS. GOULD: 2005. It's a race between my age and my existence.

[Laughter.]

MR. WILLARD: That's a legitimate question, and, in fact, I think we need to do some legal research on the whole issue of obligation to appoint -- if the Congress creates an agency, and says "the President shall appoint," does the President have to appoint? I think there must be case law on that issue. We just don't --

MR. HIGHTOWER: I could go back to Andrew Jackson and say you can't make him do anything he doesn't want to do.

MS. GOULD: And he didn't.

DR. CHALLINOR: You're talking about the bank.

MR. WILLARD: Of course, you got the impoundment of funds really in Nixon, that wouldn't allow agencies to be killed by impounding funding, so I don't know if you could make an argument --

MS. GOULD: You've got what?

PARTICIPANT: Impounded funding.

MR. WILLARD: The impoundment of funding issue came out of the Nixon --

MR. HIGHTOWER: The thing about our separation in the Committee, it could be challenged by the --

MS. GOULD: Probably.

MR. HIGHTOWER: If the number does not exist at all, it could be challenged, and we'll just hope that it won't be. I guess everybody understands that the executive committee has been meeting, however, with conference calls almost weekly.

MR. WILLARD: Not meeting.

MS. GOULD: Not meeting.

MR. WILLARD: Those were just status reports. We were not having --

MR. HIGHTOWER: But we are -- the executive committee is being convened --

MR. WILLARD: No.

MS. GOULD: No.

MR. HIGHTOWER: -- for discussions.

MS. GOULD: No. It's information only.

MR. WILLARD: It's not a meeting.

MS. GOULD: It's not a meeting.

MR. HIGHTOWER: It's been convened for information only then. I'm saying that we are in touch.

MR. WILLARD: Yes.

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MR. HIGHTOWER: We are in --

MR. WILLARD: If it is necessary for action to be taken, the executive committee will be convened the same way that a full commission meeting will be convened, in that there would be federal notice, that there would be federal notice --

MR. HIGHTOWER: I'm sorry I used the word "convened."

MR. WILLARD: Right.

MR. HIGHTOWER: We are gathered together --

MS. GOULD: It sounds like Thanksgiving.

MR. HIGHTOWER: "Come, let us reason together on Tuesday morning at 10:00 o'clock," and we do.

[Laughter.]

MR. HIGHTOWER: Okay.

MS. GOULD: Bob Martin, did you want to comment?

DR. MARTIN: No. I was just thinking of that in the context that that, especially, I am not sure who would challenge that point.

DR. GRIFFITHS: I think there is enough going on in the world that we don't rise to that level.

DR. MARTIN: I can't imagine who would go through the trouble to do that.

MR. HIGHTOWER: Bob, is there anything that you can say in this venue that would give us a heads-up on anything that we are going to be talking about this afternoon when we change our venue?

DR. MARTIN: Do you have a copy of the agenda?

MR. HIGHTOWER: Yes.

DR. MARTIN: That's all I can tell you really.

MS. GOULD: Until we get into the nitty-gritty.

DR. MARTIN: It's primarily information.

MS. GOULD: Okay. If there aren't any other questions, let's go on to administrative matters.

Are there any other questions?

PARTICIPANT: Are there any questions from the audience?

MS. GOULD: Yes.

PARTICIPANT: Do you or Bob intend to comment on the WHCLIS program in Atlanta?

MS. GOULD: Yes. Under other business.

MR. TABB: I have a question.

MS. GOULD: Yes.

MR. TABB: It's a practical one. I was really concerned by the report you were giving about the lack of support out of the Department of Education. This is really not a trivial matter for an organization that lives so close to the margin.

Are you required to use them as your agent? How can you function if you don't really have accurate information?

MR. WILLARD: Under the law, as originally passed back in 1970, we were, and it was HEW, but in the 1991 amendments, we are able to get that support any way we want. We have periodically looked into other agencies. For example, GSA has a big business in terms of supporting small agencies, and there are others that do that.

The problem is that the cost of switching is such that -- and I don't mean financial cost. I mean staff cost of switching, is just such that we cannot undertake it now, but it is on my short to-do list all the time to try and improve that.

MS. RUSSELL: There is also -- at least up to this point, in looking at other agencies that support us, there have always been enough down sides of the way they administer their things that there have been some benefits for the -- and I'm not sure that those benefits continue now to outweigh it.

We used to, for instance, until June of this year -- no. When did that change? We used to be able to print our own checks here on a laser printer, so we could actually do a purchase, write a check. And then they switched that around. And so now in the past, looking at GSA, where we had to send things out to Kansas City, or somewhere, and it would take a week to ten days to get a check issued, well, now, Ed is getting things all done electronically, and it's taking three to five days to get a payment, but it's still better than the GSA schedule was.

MR. TABB: But it's not so serious you're concerned about being in deficit without knowing it?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, it is serious.

MR. TABB: It is one thing not to do an annual report and be in default in a technical way, but to be in deficit --

MS. RUSSELL: It's very serious, because among the other things that they've done is that they switched to their new financial system in mid-January, and they made no effort, because they did not want to put in the expense, and this applies to our whole department, not just to us, to migrate anything other than totals from the first quarter, forward. So when you get a report, you cannot see all of your expenditures in their financial system.

In the frustration of trying to do the financial report for this month to give to you, I got some summary data from someone at Ed, and in one category along, which is one of our larger expenses categories which is what's called contractual services, but where all of our consulting fees fall, I could identify purchase orders and credit card transactions of \$83,000, and they were reporting obligations of \$78,000, and nobody could explain to me the discrepancy.

That's too little to have been the whole first quarter set of numbers, but it's too much to be overlooked. So here we are a quarter of the way from the end of the year -- it's very difficult to get --

DR. GRIFFITHS: Are these changes, I mean the fact that they changed their financial system, related to the fact that you have not received --

MS. RUSSELL: No.

DR. GRIFFITHS: -- your phones?

MS. RUSSELL: The phones have not flowed because of the handling within NCES and OREI of the paperwork to move them, plus, even though this is something we have been doing for how many years, 15, 17, something, and the contract this year is virtually identical to the contract last year, which is virtually identical to the one the year before -- it went through a general counsel's review, and there have been three or four times where they wanted to change, and then because of the passage of time, they wanted another change. And they're preserving the fiction that they're only paying us from the time the contract is signed, forward, and so after a certain amount of time elapsed, they pull it back and re-date it. It's just -- it's ludicrous.

MR. WILLARD: It affects everybody. They've got other offices that belong to the Department of Education that are remote from their central, and they forget them, and they also -- within the Department, they have offices that are affected, but they have five or six people who do nothing but deal with the problems of the financial system, whereas it is --

MS. RUSSELL: I came in February of 1998. This is the third financial system. I know you guys are moving to Oracle, and I spoke to Susan Tarr Flick about this, because they moved to Oracle. That's the new one. They took it off the shelf. They didn't want to spend money on modifying it.

So we've had this huge amount of training going on to understand that -- although, in this report, it says company name. We're using it to actually do the accounting string for something else, so the names on the reports mean nothing because they are using the fields differently, but they didn't want to pay the customer. I mean it's just been kind of an unbelievable process, but they've been under a huge scrutiny from GAO, and the IG, and

things for their practices, and so this is part of an attempt to tighten up and clean up, but it's been handled in a very inept manner.

MS. GOULD: Judy has been careful about documenting it, so if push comes to shove, we can show where the problems lie.

MS. RUSSELL: We've been keeping our own records as a way to sort of cross-check them, but it's kind of hard to cross-check them when you can't get a report that let's you -- as I said, I cross-checked this one account and saw a discrepancy, but I can't get information out of them that will let me know where the discrepancy is coming from. So closing this year is going to be very difficult.

MR. TABB: I think it's good for the record to show, since we are --

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

MR. TABB: -- a board that needs to do due diligence, and we've asked these questions --

MS. RUSSELL: Oh, very much so.

MR. TABB: -- and I urge you to continue to move to --

MS. GOULD: I have discussed this issue ad nauseum with Judy.

MS. RUSSELL: She listens to me gripe quite regularly, as does Bob.

[Laughter.]

MS. GOULD: Are there any other questions at this point? If not, I would like to ask Denise: Do you have any comments or further clarification on your statistics programs?

MS. DAVIS: The only thing to report is the NISO Library Statistics Standard Committee had a preliminary draft that we launched at ALA on June 14th, and we're very hopeful, there are some minor adjustments we need to make to the standard, which, in fact, is a database, if not a paper standard, that we will be meeting our deadline of launching it in July of this year, and it will be open for comments.

It's the draft standard for trial use. It's the language that NISO uses, and it will be open for a 12-month period for comments. In fact, I've already received comments from people who have looked at the draft.

MS. GOULD: That's great. Thank you. I apologize. I had hoped to make that meeting.

MS. DAVIS: There wasn't any room. It was standing room only. People were in the hallway. It was a very good turnout.

MS. GOULD: And that pleases me to no end.

Woody, did you have anything to add in terms of the international forum?

MR. HORTON: Just two quick things: I have here two stacks of hard copy of the first group of papers that have been written that we will publish, as Bob said, on-line, for anybody who wishes to take a look at them.

You may recall that we had 23 different countries who were committed to attending the conference, if we can find the financing, and we have papers now that have been written by 22 of the 30. And of that 22, we have 8 that have passed by some heavy editing on our part and on Patricia Breivik's. So they are here for anybody to look at.

We were told by The World Bank on Monday, as Bob said, that we will hear by the end of July. We have been told through kind of a back channel that we are on the short list of some ten applicants for the \$125,000 that we asked for.

DR. CHALLINOR: What would the \$125,000 buy us if we got it?

MR. HORTON: It will put us about 80 percent. We budgeted a total amount for \$175,000 for all expenses, including NCLIS own modest contribution, but I would say we could fund the travel for about 75 or 80 percent of the people with that money.

DR. CHALLINOR: And buy us the meeting in Prague, the cost of --

MR. HORTON: Yes, the hotel and et cetera.

MS. GOULD: Okay. If there are no more questions or information updates, I'm going to do the WHCLIS under "other." Administrative matters, future meetings? It's all up in the air.

MR. WILLARD: I think we do -- assuming that there will be a continuing -- I don't think there will be any more meetings in this fiscal year. Assuming there will be a continuing resolution on October 1st, we will have funds that will allow us to have a meeting in the first quarter, and I think we ought to just work with you on your calendars --

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MR. WILLARD: -- to figure out when and where.

MS. GOULD: Judy, do you want to take a stab at it?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, there is in your folder a copy of the financial report. I'm not going to go over it in great detail, but just to say to you that things are very tight. We are managing things as carefully as we can.

The problem always is in evaluating our budget is that we budget for the appropriation, but then we also have money coming in from these other sources, which has not yet come. So some of the issues -- for example, in the consulting services, we had budgeted very low, expecting that we would use some of the discretionary money that we had coming in from state and NCS to cover some of those expenses. We have gone ahead and expended our money, so we will offset other expenses with those funds when they come in, and sort of do some accounting that lets us sort of say "We'll pay for this out of this money in lieu of having paid for that, which we went ahead and funded."

So it makes it a little tricky to look at kind of the allocations versus the expenditures, but with 25 percent of the year to go, we have about 15 percent of our appropriation left, but we do not yet have any of the \$266,000 of outside money in hand.

So it will be more critical once we know for sure how much SECA money we are getting, and once we get the NCES money, and we'll be able to restate this in a way that will more accurately reflect how we're covering our expenditures through the year. But it is very tight.

And as Bob said, we may, at the end, and we're sort of pushing it back as much as we can, and we may at the end need to do some furloughing or some other kinds of cuts.

MS. GOULD: Okay. That takes care of that. Again, I would like to point out that Judy is doing herculean duty on dealing with the problems that we have getting good information out of the Department of Education, in terms of our finances, and the financial reports.

Thank you for bringing the issue up, Winston, because we are keeping exhaustive documentation. It's good for everyone on the Commission. Understand that a lot of our problems are lack of good information.

We already talked about, under new business, the Bessie Moore centennial.

Bob and I did attend the WHCLIS meeting when we were at ALA. They are still planning to remain in existence. This is a body of incredibly dedicated library supporters, persistent, that I have been favored to know. They are hanging in there.

They are looking at what was done with the school library meeting at The White House, and thinking on those terms. They are going to be reaching out -- first of all, they have money. They actually are solvent, with a very good bank balance. I'm not quite sure how they came about that, but they have a good bank balance.

DR. CHALLINOR: Why, I think they give it themselves.

MS. GOULD: They fund themselves.

DR. CHALLINOR: Yes. They fund themselves.

MS. GOULD: So they are going to be going back to their membership list and querying them on, "Do they want to remain as a task force? Do they want to remain as an entity."

But they were beginning to think very seriously about replicating in some manner the type of half-day conference that was held at The White House on school libraries. That's pretty much where they are standing at this point, and they do have a set of officers, and they are just -- they are just the most incredibly dedicated people I have -- it just boggles the mind. They are putting their money and their efforts where their mouth is.

DR. CHALLINOR: Well, Martha, that's -- I mean when we started with them several years ago, they were talking about a ten-day conference, then it was a five-day conference, then it was a one-day. I think this is good news.

[Laughter.]

DR. CHALLINOR: I mean I think that we have gotten them to move to something realistic that might actually come off. I don't think this is bad news at all.

MS. GOULD: Well, I don't either, and what I love is the fact that they're hanging in there, and they're staying together, and some of them have been together for 20 years. They have grown older in the service.

I apologize. I should have had my China report finished. I don't. Life got in the way. I'm not going to go in any great detail. If you want to, talk with me afterwards. But I will complete my report.

This morning, I had a request from Senator Reid's executive assistant, Janis Shelton, that I make my China report available to Senator Reid.

DR. CHALLINOR: Well, good.

MS. GOULD: So you all will get it, but the Senator will also get it.

DR. CHALLINOR: What about the one from Rhode Island, also? Isn't he the other --

MR. WILLARD: In general, we want to get some visibility on that report.

PARTICIPANT: We don't care about the trip to Rhode Island.

[Laughter.]

MS. GOULD: Who cares about Rhode Island?

[Laughter.]

MR. WILLARD: I would suggest that what you learned in China, while we are looking forward to the written report, maybe it might be appropriate in this afternoon's session to just have a little time for Martha to talk about that under new business, because I think --

MS. GOULD: It was fascinating. I did send a letter vis- -vis the Minnesota State Library. You have a copy of the letter. We are going to be discussing a Minnesota I believe this afternoon. With that --

DR. CHALLINOR: I'd like to do one other thing. I consider Trust and Terror, and the whole effort, one of the best things that we have ever done, and I want to pay tribute to José for having brought it up. That's where it came from, and I think it's entirely appropriate that we take a moment to say thank you to José, because I think this response to an unusual event is the best thing we've done, and it's the best face that we have at the moment to go to the public with, to the Congress, to -- you know.

I have a friend who is a French speaker. I sent the brochure to her to look at the French and see if there was anything that was wrong, and she sent me back a letter in email, which praised the idea, and said that it was -- "I also think," and she says, "opinions come at very low cost. The people who go to broadcast media, battery-powered, and car radios, and the Internet, when those all are working, the advantage of public libraries, which is presented in this text, is the accuracy of information and the community which can come from gathering in your area, rather than the isolation of being in one's home. This should be emphasized."

It is the brainchild of José Griffiths, and I want to say thank you from the Commission for having brought this to us, because it's a great effort.

DR. GRIFFITHS: Well, thank you. It is a collective effort, of course. Long hours.

[Applause.]

MS. GOULD: I also would like to point out, sadly, that this will be the last formal meeting for both José and Rebecca, because their extension year is up on July 19th.

And, Winston, moving on from the Library of Congress to his new job at the Johns Hopkins, this will probably be your last meeting, too, and you will be missed.

MR. WILLARD: Although you could get yourself appointed.

MS. GOULD: In fact, all three of you will be missed, and I hope even though you will become "former" commissioners, you will keep in touch with us, and we will be calling on you for counsel and advice.

MR. WILLARD: We do have a tradition of former commissioners being reappointed.

DR. GRIFFITHS: I was going to say, I'm assuming and hope that we stay on Bob's mailing list --

MS. GOULD: Oh, yes.

DR. GRIFFITHS: -- which I know is expensive, with the updates on what happens as it unfolds. We'll be watching.

MS. GOULD: With that --

PARTICIPANT: The audience?

MS. GOULD: Yes. That's the next thing.

Are there any comments from our guests?

MS. RUSSELL: Just one thing I'd like to say about the Senate bill. We have two more Senators added on, Senators Corzine and Torricelli from New Jersey. Apparently, people listened to us at the conference, and they called when they got home. So I look forward to a grand swell of more Senators joining on. There's already a pretty substantial number, so we're hopeful that we'll move --

MS. GOULD: I don't think my Senator, Reid, has signed on yet, but we know he has -- he's a little bit sidetracked by something called Yucca Mountain.

MS. RUSSELL: We do have Senator Daschle, however, which I think is a good thing, since he schedules the bills. So that's my comment.

MR. WILLARD: I yield to my colleague, David LeDuc.

MS. GOULD: David.

MR. LEDUC: Thank you. First, I'd like to reiterate our position in support of the Commission. Earlier this year, we had a meeting, and the discussion, the first one we'd had in a while, and certainly the first one we had had since my dealing several years ago with information policy, and it was the overwhelming consensus of the information policy group, myself included, that the Commission plays a very valuable role.

The Commission has done a lot of good things over the years in its existence. A lot of those have preceded me, but I have certainly been made aware of them, and am constantly looking back to them, so our letter was a reflection of the support, of the value of the Commission.

As Bob, I think, articulated very well earlier, it is a difficult situation that the Commission is in, that it needs to look at political ramifications. That's certainly not the position that we want to see the Commission in. In fact, that's why we support the Commission, is because we like the ability of the Commission to come out with objective thoughts and recommend policies.

And we are also disappointed, as everyone else here is, in the current status of the Commission, which regarding the Commissioners, and your ability, and your funding in this very difficult time, and we recognize that. We look forward to a better time, and we hope that your optimism is accurate, and that we have optimism as well that the Commission will continue effectively.

One of the issues that we, as an organization, will get involved in is government information policy. And I understand from the report today, and previous action, that the Commission has been a little less active in that area. We hope that at some point you will have the opportunity to become more active. It's certainly something that we are looking at.

One of the things that we continue to talk about in the last couple of years is that this is really a critical time, and I think you've touched on this with the comprehensive assessment, with digital technologies, electronic dissemination. There's a lot going on.

I think back then we were just in the beginning. I think now we are somewhere in the beginning, and here in the middle of the transition, and I think this is a critical time. I think it's particularly a critical time for the Commission to continue to look in your policies, and making recommendations, as we have a lot further to go.

As was earlier pointed out, obviously, with the September 11th, and looking at new roles of the Commission, in that regard, you've got your hands full. You're picking and choosing where you need to be, taking positions, being active. We do hope that the Commission will be able to go back to government information policy, and information policy in general.

I think that is a good segue to make an announcement. We have just nailed down a date for an information policy conference that we will be having. SIAA will be hosting the first policy conference we've had in a while on information policy. The date will be October 2nd. It will be here in D.C. It will be at the University Club, just down the street. So it will be easy for me, and a couple of us who are locals.

All of you are invited to attend and participate, and I hope that you all can and will. Many of you will be approached, and I would like to talk to most of you separately, individually at different times to get your input and recommendations, and participation.

Just to give you a little bit of an overview, we're still working out the program, but we really want to look at -- continue to look at dissemination of information, how the rules have changed, if at all, between the private sector and the public sector. Is there a larger role for the government right now? Is there a smaller role for the government? Is there a larger role for industry? It's some of the things that you began to look at, and I don't think policymakers are looking at.

We don't believe that policymakers in the Congress or in the Administration have taken an overarching kind of look at this, and certainly, I think there is a dearth of good thought on the subject. So we are going to look at that.

And we are also going to look at things that are not just government information, but educational information, educational resource materials, as have been suggested and worked into various different legislative approaches. What are the roles there? What are the roles for the private sector and the public sector, and are they changing, and are there new obligations for the government for a lot of people? I certainly think that there are.

We are going to just look at a bunch of those different topics that I don't think have been explored very well, and I hope to have a very good conference. Again, you will have more information. I'll make sure that it finds its way to you, and I personally would like to talk to many of you about participating.

MS. GOULD: Thank you. Again, thank you for your support.

MR. LEDUC: Absolutely.

MS. GOULD: Any other comments from our audience?

[No response.]

MS. GOULD: If not, we are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.]