

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2010

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 3:33 p.m., in room SD-138, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Ben Nelson (chairman) presiding.
Present: Senators Nelson, Pryor, and Murkowski.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES H. BILLINGTON, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

ACCOMPANIED BY:

JO ANN JENKINS, CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER
DANIEL P. MULHOLLAN, DIRECTOR, CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
ROBERTA SHAFFER, LAW LIBRARIAN

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR BEN NELSON

Senator NELSON. Good afternoon, everyone. I think what we will do is we will get started, and when my ranking member arrives, then we will have her give any opening statement she would like to make.

I want to welcome all today. We meet this afternoon for our fourth and final legislative branch budget hearing for fiscal year 2011. Today, we will hear from the Library of Congress (LOC) and the Open World Leadership Center.

It is my pleasure to welcome in short order my ranking member. We have worked very well together, and I know we will continue to be able to do that, as well in the future. And I welcome her right now.

And I also want to welcome our witnesses—Dr. James Billington, the Librarian of Congress, and Ambassador John O’Keefe, Executive Director of the Open World Leadership Center. It is good to have you, as well as Ms. Jo Ann Jenkins. It is good to have you gentlemen and lady here this afternoon, and we look forward to hearing from you.

If it is possible to keep opening statements brief, around 5 minutes, it would be very helpful. And of course, the rest of the testimony would be received for the record.

One thing that we have established at our first three hearings—and I think it bears repeating—is that we intend to hold the legis-

lative branch flat this year. I believe that spending restraints start at home, and we need to lead by example on this subcommittee. We can't do that by appropriating large increases to our agencies.

I think the President sent the message so loudly and clearly in his State of the Union Address this year, noting that families across our country are tightening their belts and making tough decisions, and the Federal Government must do the same, he said, and he announced a 3-year freeze on nonsecurity discretionary Government spending.

The President said, "Like any cash-strapped family, we will work within a budget to invest in what we need and sacrifice what we don't."

And he warned further, "If we don't take meaningful steps to rein in our debt, it could damage our markets, increase the cost of borrowing, and jeopardize our recovery—all of which would have an even worse effect on our job growth and family incomes."

Dr. Billington, I want to welcome you and your Chief Operating Officer, Jo Ann Jenkins. Sadly, I understand that Ms. Jenkins has accepted a position as the executive director of the American Association of Retired Persons Foundation. When I say "sadly," I am not sad that you are accepting that position, I am sad that you will be leaving the Library next month.

We appreciate the 15 years that you have been a steadfast presence at the Library, and of course, we wish you the very best. Among her many accomplishments are her work on the Library's Bicentennial Celebration, management and oversight of nine National Book Festivals, the opening of the new Library of Congress Experience at the Jefferson Building, and the completion of the Library of Congress and the U.S. Capitol Police merger.

So, on behalf of the Senate, and in particular this subcommittee, I want to thank you for your service to the Library of Congress and very much wish you success and happiness in your future.

Thank you.

The Library this year is requesting \$670 million for fiscal year 2011, an increase of \$31.4 million, or 4.8 percent, over the fiscal year 2010 enacted level, as well as 30 additional full-time equivalents (FTEs). I understand about one-half of these new FTEs and around \$5 million are for expanded research capabilities at the Congressional Research Service (CRS). So I look forward to hearing your testimony and discussing the particulars of your request.

As a brief aside, I continue to hear from a number of organizations concerned about the performance royalties bill that would affect local radio stations. And I make this brief note here only because of the Copyright Royalty Board's potential role under this legislation. And along with many of my colleagues, I continue to oppose this bill and wouldn't support an attempt to attach such legislation to an appropriations bill, whether it is this one or any of the others, for that matter.

And I also want to welcome Ambassador O'Keefe of the Open World Leadership Center. Ambassador O'Keefe and I had a pleasant experience in Lincoln, Nebraska, where he conducted an evening discussion of the work of the Open World Leadership that was not limited to Nebraskans, but many from Iowa, Kansas, and

the surrounding areas were there as well. I thought it was an excellent presentation. I appreciate that.

Ambassador O'Keefe, your budget request totals \$14 million, an increase of \$2 million, or 16.6 percent, above current year. I strongly support the important work done by Open World and its commitment to Congress and the legislative branch, and I look forward to hearing your testimony as well.

Now it is my pleasure to turn to my ranking member, Senator Murkowski, for her opening remarks. And as I said at the beginning, we have enjoyed a wonderful working relationship, and I know that is going to continue well into the future.

So the podium is all yours.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LISA MURKOWSKI

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

And as we have gone through these series of discussions with the various entities that are under the oversight of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, you have been very consistent in conveying the message that we do need to be conscientious about our budgets. We do need to be setting the standard, and we have been working together well in that regard.

I welcome you this afternoon to the subcommittee and join the chairman in his comments of welcome to you, Dr. Billington. It is always good to see you.

Mr. Chairman, you might not have known, but Dr. Billington was the star in one of our Alaska reports where he was able to highlight some of the collection that is housed over there in the Library of Congress that relates to the history of my State. And I think it was one of our more popular programs in terms of the viewership. So I commend you for that, and it was a wonderful learning opportunity.

I also extend my warm welcome to you, Ambassador O'Keefe, and appreciate your leadership over at the Open World Leadership Center. Appreciate both of you being here today to discuss how your agencies are planning to move forward in this upcoming fiscal year.

Ms. Jenkins, I join the chairman in commending you on your 15 years of service. We greatly appreciate it and wish you well in your coming endeavors over at the AARP. I know that everyone who has had an opportunity to work with you will miss you, but they have appreciated all your years of service.

Mr. Chairman, you have provided the assessment or the overview, if you will, of the Library of Congress budget request and mentioned the increase in additional full-time equivalents, the FTEs, 30 FTEs. I look forward to hearing why the Library needs these additional FTEs at this time, whether or not this is a permanent expansion of the Library or perhaps a temporary solution to a shorter-term situation.

As far as the Open World Leadership Center fiscal year request, I do understand that the fiscal year 2011 budget request is only \$100,000 over the fiscal year 2009 enacted level of \$13.9 million, but the Center is currently living within the fiscal year 2010 enacted level of \$12 million. So I am anxious to hear why the Center

feels that it needs to return to the previous funding level. So I will look forward to hearing your response to that.

And again, welcome both gentlemen and Ms. Jenkins to the subcommittee.

Senator NELSON. Dr. Billington.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES H. BILLINGTON

Dr. BILLINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senator Murkowski.

It is really an honor to be here to present the fiscal year 2011 budget request of the Library of Congress just 5 days after the 210th anniversary of its birth as the Nation's oldest Federal cultural institution.

I am accompanied, as you both noted, for the last time by our outstanding Chief Operating Officer, Ms. Jo Ann Jenkins, who will leave, as you pointed out, to become on June 1, in fact, president of the AARP Foundation. That happens to be my birthday, June 1. This is an unusual type of negative present.

But we are grateful for all that she has done.

Now, among those with me today for the first time are Roberta Shaffer, the new Law Librarian of Congress. Ms. Shaffer has much experience in the Library and the broader legal community. And two who have served the Library well for 20 years and will assume new responsibilities in June as members of the Executive Committee—Robert Dizard, who will become Chief of Staff, and Lucy Suddreth, who will become Chief of Support Operations. They are both here as well.

Now, Mr. Chairman and Senator Murkowski, recognizing the difficult budget environment that you have both mentioned, we are presenting a lean funding request, a 4.6 percent increase over fiscal year 2010. Fifty-eight percent of the increase is for required pay raises for our excellent staff and price level increases. Sixteen percent is for addressing urgent congressional needs in CRS. And the smaller remaining requests are largely to strengthen staff management capabilities and to support clear Library-wide priorities.

These requests are mainly for people, which are urgently needed by an institution doing many times more work than in 1992, but with 1,076 fewer employees. Our workforce has become ever more skilled and creative in order to remain the "library of last resort" and to acquire, as we have, our national and international leadership role in building a new electronic library while sustaining a traditional one and the values of the book culture itself.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has created and, thanks to your subcommittee and your leadership, sustained the largest, most inclusive, best-preserved record in one place of both the world's knowledge in 460 languages and America's creativity in all kinds of fields. In many ways, the Library of Congress contains our Nation's strategic information reserve, preserves the cultural patrimony of our free and diverse people, and is a lighthouse to the world for a whole concept of a knowledge-based democracy.

We are now nearing completion of a focused effort that I initiated 10 months ago collaboratively to address Library-wide management requirements—a mid-course review of our strategic plan, strength-

ening governance and processes in information technology, and integrating the Library's Web presence into the central core of our work and our management structure across the entire Library.

In the last 20 years of, in effect, superimposing an entirely new digital library on top of our traditional artifactual one, we have created an education-focused National Digital Library of 19 million items, almost all of which are original documents of American history and culture. We put online just 1 month ago in Paris a World Digital Library with UNESCO support, including some material from the cultures of all 193 United Nations (U.N.) nations.

We now have enormous digital content and work with 170 partner institutions in this country and 44 different States in leading a national program to archive important materials online, in accordance with our congressional mandate.

But in the past 10 years, global book publishing has also increased by 40 percent. Digital information is proliferating virally, as we say, but it will never replace our heritage assets or, indeed, other new physical records that continue to be added to our often one-of-a-kind collections.

FORT MEADE MODULE 5

Our most critical material need and highest mission priority this year is for Fort Meade Module 5, as requested in the Architect of the Capitol's fiscal year 2011 budget. We are already 8 years behind in the storage schedule for Fort Meade that we established with Congress and began implementing in 1997. The already functioning modules are efficiently compacted, magnificently controlled for preservation, and have provided prompt, 100 percent delivery to our Capitol Hill reading rooms of all materials so far requested.

This fifth module is essential if we are to sustain our core mission of preserving and making accessible collections needed both for present and for future generations. The Library of Congress is the only institution in the world capable of sustaining collections on this scale. Our key role for America in the information age could be compromised, perhaps irretrievably, if we cannot continue to acquire original written and published materials.

These artifactual materials often provide the only near-permanent records of human creativity and, unlike digital materials, cannot be tampered with, censored, or rendered inaccessible by technological obsolescence.

Thanks to this subcommittee's wonderful support, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we already have state-of-the-art preservation storage not only at Fort Meade, but also in Culpeper at the world's biggest and best facility for audio-visual conservation. We must continue to grow, preserve, and provide access to our artifactual collections if they are to remain usable for Congress, and we will need space to store them.

PREPARED STATEMENTS

Thank you again for your support for the Library and for your consideration of our fiscal year 2011 budget.

[The statements follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES H. BILLINGTON

Mr. Chairman, Senator Murkowski, and other Members of the Subcommittee: I am pleased to present the Library of Congress fiscal 2011 budget request.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you and the subcommittee for your outstanding support for our fiscal 2010 request, which included a major investment in an initiative to renew and restore the Library's technological infrastructure. Through the 2009–2010 Management Agenda process, which I initiated last July, we are enhancing the governance and internal oversight of information technology investments to assure the most effective use of, and maximum accountability for, these funds.

In recognition of the difficult budget environment, we are requesting a total fiscal 2011 budget of \$715.5 million, a lean increase of \$31.4 million or 4.6 percent over fiscal 2010. Fifty-eight percent of this request is for mandatory pay and price level increases. The largest program element in the modest requested increase for critical operations is the \$4.9 million needed to address urgent Congressional needs in the Congressional Research Service budget. Our requested increase of 30 FTEs is necessitated by the greatly increased workload of the Library during the period from 1992 to 2010, in which an entire digital library has been added to the traditional library while the level of FTEs has fallen by 1,076 FTEs to 3,770.

The details of the Library's budget request are described in this statement. At the start, I want to address a subject of paramount importance: the Library's collections. Our most critical need and highest priority this year is Fort Meade Module 5—for which funding is requested in the AOC's fiscal 2011 budget.

The increased importance of this unique repository of human knowledge is solidly based on its history. Over two centuries, the Congress has built its Library into the largest and most diverse collection of human knowledge ever assembled by one institution. The Library also preserves the closest thing to a mint record of America's creativity thanks largely to its exclusive status as the depository of copyrighted works. It annually collects significant world cultural and scholarly resources in more languages and formats than any library in the world. Sustaining Congress' support for the mission of this unique American cultural institution is more important than ever before in this "information age," when our economy and leadership depend more and more on usable knowledge.

When the original library, housed in the Capitol, was burned by British troops in 1814, Thomas Jefferson within a month offered his personal library as a replacement. The Jeffersonian concept of universality argued that all subjects are important to the library of the American legislature, and this has guided the comprehensive collecting policies of the Library.

The Library of Congress is the only institution in the world capable of sustaining collections on this scale. We cannot foresee all that will be important to those who come after us. But we have innumerable examples of how past items we saved have proven useful later in unforeseen ways. We are inspired as well as informed by preserving the thoughts, anxieties, achievements, and aspirations of past generations. If we collect less and the Library's collections diminish, future generations will know that we deprived them of that open window into their past.

I have been asked, "When is this going to stop?" If we want the Library of Congress to exist for future generations as it does for us today and has for generations past, it cannot, should not stop. Our request for Fort Meade Storage Module 5 is not about another building. It is about preserving our collections and protecting the very essence of the Library of Congress.

I can assure you that the Library of Congress does not keep everything. We have carefully thought-out acquisitions policies, developed and updated regularly by our curators and other experts. We continually work to improve our collections management, including inventory management, and with the Congress' great support, we now have storage modules at Fort Meade to secure and preserve our most valuable items. We will continue to do everything we can to be more efficient; but we will continue to need more space to store the Library's growing collections, and we are heartened by having a 100 percent retrieval rate from the Fort Meade repositories to our reading rooms.

I have also been asked why we need to sustain collections when so much content is available electronically. It is a myth that as digital content has exploded onto the scene, hard copy materials are significantly declining. In fact, in the past 10 years alone, global book publishing has increased by 40 percent, and published books are increasing in number everywhere except (and for the first time this year) in the USA. The Library has enormous digital content holdings, but digital information will never replace our heritage assets, the physical record of knowledge and creativity represented in the collections. And there is a need to keep hard copies of

many materials in view of the risks of tampering and the impermanence of much digital material.

The Library of Congress was established out of our forefathers' conviction that knowledge is important to governance. Jefferson in essence established our collections policy. I believe that he would understand why we must continue to build the collections even though we face challenges in being able to store them, preserve them, and make them accessible. For the past 210 years, the Congress has made it a priority, through good times and bad, to allocate resources to properly fund the Library of Congress—to meet its acquisition and related storage needs. As a result, people living today have access to an incredible record of knowledge and creativity.

If we succeed in our mission, our descendants—25, 50, and 200 years from now—will be able to benefit from what we found important to acquire and preserve in 2011.

Facing both relentless technological change and ever-increasing demands on the Federal budget, the Library has to be both disciplined and creative to fulfill its historic mission of service to the Congress and to the American people.

This budget request is informed by an ambitious 2009–2010 Management Agenda that I launched in July 2009 to ensure that the Library's investment priorities are focused even as its programs reflect new ideas and solutions. We have instituted a Library-wide approach to updating the Library's strategic plan and aggressively developed coordinated plans for information resource management, enterprise architecture, human capital management, facilities management, website content, the acquisition of electronic works through mandatory deposit, and the creation of a culture of innovation at the Library.

The Management Agenda also addresses findings from a number of recent internal management-related studies, including a report from an internal Library Committee on Strategic Direction, an Inspector General report on information technology strategic planning, and a Library-wide employee survey. The agenda will help the Library's Executive Committee continue to strengthen Library decisionmaking, allocation of resources, and accountability.

Since its July launch, the Management Agenda has emphasized the development of results-oriented outcomes, broad involvement from all levels of Library staff and managers, and implementation of best practices in Library management structures and processes.

For the Library's fiscal 2011 request, our principal requests for program increases are for:

Broadening Research Capacity and Enhancing Data Management Technology to Better Serve Congress on Complex Emerging Policy Issues

Broaden Research Capacity—\$2.8 million

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) requests funding and FTEs in fiscal 2011 to broaden its expertise and strengthen analytical capacity in the areas of science and technology, healthcare, financial economics and accounting, and social policy related to employment, immigration, and the work force. This funding will enable CRS to enhance its unique multidisciplinary analysis on the range of complex policy issues before the Congress. The request is the first half of a 2-year initiative to provide the additional analytical skills needed to fully support the expanding needs of the Congress in these areas. This additional analytical capacity will also give CRS the long-term flexibility to adapt to rapidly changing issues and debates that will arise in these critical areas.

Enhance Technology—\$2.1 million

CRS also requests funding to adapt and strengthen its information technology research architecture in order to meet growing congressional demands in almost every policy area for analysis requiring an increasing quantity of complex data. This funding will enable CRS to create and maintain a state-of-the-art information research architecture, establish a robust research data management (RDM) structure, and develop new mechanisms to deliver CRS products and services to its congressional clients.

Assuring Access to the Collections Now and into the Future

The Library's fiscal 2011 budget request includes modest support for key operational and technological improvements that directly affect the delivery of core mission services. The request will support our newly reorganized strategic planning efforts over the last several years to prioritize our needs and allocation of resources.

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate Space Reconfiguration—\$1.05 million

The request includes support for a reconfiguration of space in the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate (ABA) to realize efficiencies in acquiring and processing collections materials. This is a critical core function of the Library. Heretofore these processes have been based on a century-old library model. Work processes have been reengineered and streamlined, and now a space reconfiguration is needed to fully implement our new workflow model by creating appropriate processing areas, mail receiving areas, shelving, and secure housing areas.

Collections Inventory Management—\$1 million

The requested increase in funding will also help to make inventory control an ongoing, core function. This funding will support the continuation of the baseline inventory initiative begun in 2002, as well as the inventory work related to the transfer of collections to Fort Meade. The Library is working with leaders in the private sector to identify and incorporate best practices in inventory control.

Integrated Workflow and System Replacement—\$1.35 million

The Library also requests funding to take full advantage of technology by completing the analysis of Library Services' systems and workflows begun in fiscal 2009. This effort is developing a process management system to integrate current systems and databases, thereby streamlining Library-wide business functions. The Library's renewed enterprise architecture program will guide the development of the system. This request also includes support for the replacement of an inadequate MS DOS-based order, distribution, and accounting software system used by the Library's overseas offices.

Elimination of Foreign Legal Gazette Backlog and Class K Conversion—\$1.1 million

Finally, to ensure that the law collection is both comprehensive and current, the Library requests funding for contractual services to eliminate a preservation backlog of foreign legal gazettes, as well as personnel resources to reclassify 610,000 volumes in the law collections. This reclassification will allow new legal specialists to search and retrieve all portions of the collections, as staff members most familiar with the older classification system retire.

Investing in Human Capital

Supervisor Development—\$1.05 million

In alignment with the Management Agenda's focus on human capital management, the Library requests an investment in developing supervisors and staff, as well as funding for a Library-wide student loan program to support recruitment and retention of the next generation of Library employees. The request for funding for supervisory development flows in part from a Library-wide employee survey, which revealed the need for enhanced supervisory and leadership skills to develop new and existing supervisors with the skills to hire and cultivate a diverse and effective workforce.

Staff Development—\$1.6 million

The Library requests funding to invest in staff development to address critical training gaps, and to develop and sustain a culture of innovation. Funding for the Library-wide student loan program modeled on the programs of the Congress and the Executive Branch will give the Library the retention and recruitment tool that it needs.

Ensuring Effective and Efficient Maintenance and Operation of the Library's Public Spaces and Facilities

Public Space Maintenance and Operations—\$1.5 million

The Library's request includes funding to support Library-wide and public space facility needs. The expanding workload associated with the greatly increased number of visitors, aging historic buildings, complex regulatory requirements, and broad new energy conservation initiatives cannot be accomplished with currently available resources. In fiscal 2011, the Library requests support to address flooring issues in public spaces, including carpeting that has long ago exceeded its normal replacement cycle; to implement greening and energy conservation initiatives; to eliminate an Office of Compliance-reported workstation safety hazard; to modernize food service areas; and to expand the use of contract professional design and engineering services as recommended by the Office of the Inspector General.

Furniture Inventory Management—\$391,000

In addition, the request includes funding to implement an ongoing contract for an automated furniture inventory and recycling system for furniture reuse. This funding will support the Library's highly successful furniture inventory and reuse pilot project, which since 2006 has effectively reused 13,196 pieces of furniture to achieve a 3-year savings/cost avoidance roughly ten times the annual cost of a furniture inventory management contract. This requested funding will also support a small stock of high demand, frequently needed items for rapid provision to offices that are experiencing losses of productivity because of the long lead time required for procurement processing.

*Acquiring In-House IT Capability in the Electronic Copyright Office (eCO) and Licensing/Royalty Distribution Systems**Copyright Technology Office IT Support—\$475,000*

In response to an increase in responsibilities related to system infrastructure and development support for the electronic Copyright Office (eCO) system on which the great majority of Copyright Office activities are processed, the Copyright Office requests funding to acquire in-house IT expertise for the system. This funding will provide highly skilled and experienced IT professionals to support the eCO system so that the Copyright Office will rely less on contract support for day-to-day maintenance and operations. This funding will also result in more detailed and efficient system implementation and testing.

Licensing Reengineering Project—\$790,000

The Copyright Office also requests funding for contractor support to complete the implementation of the Licensing Division reengineering effort to automate the royalty calculations process. Reengineering Licensing's processes and automating the calculations process will improve productivity and strengthen responsiveness to both copyright claimants and users of the public licenses. In addition, the Copyright Office requests funding for IT staffing to support the reengineered licensing/royalty distribution system.

The committee last year appropriately expressed concern about the number of copyright registration applications waiting processing. Through internal efforts in the Copyright Office and a recent program which I initiated to temporarily assign 50 other Library personnel to the Office, we have made a significant reduction—close to 70,000 claims—in that backlog. Both the Register and I will continue to give this effort a high priority.

In summary, senior management's extensive recent efforts to renew and improve governance processes and accountability across the Library account for our fiscal 2011 funding request to support these critical operational requirements and immediate congressional needs.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you again for your support and your consideration of our fiscal 2011 budget.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DANIEL P. MULHOLLAN

Mr. Chairman, Senator Murkowski, and other Members of the Subcommittee: Thank you for the opportunity to present the fiscal year 2011 budget request for the Congressional Research Service (CRS). I would also like to describe how we align our work with that of the Congress to serve you most effectively and steps we are taking to ensure continued success in that mission.

ALIGNMENT OF CRS WORK WITH THE CONGRESS

CRS works closely with the Congress on a daily basis and has maintained this working relationship since its inception. Members know they can count on CRS to be nonpartisan, objective, authoritative, and confidential. Experts at the Service align their work with the congressional agenda from the moment a new issue arises and continue to meet the needs of lawmakers throughout all stages of the legislative process and across the full range of active public policy issues. CRS analysts examine the nature and extent of problems facing the Congress, identify and assess policy options, assist with hearings on policy proposals and on implementation of existing policies.

We closely support the Senate in the confirmation process involving executive officers and judges and are currently gearing up for another nomination to fill a Supreme Court vacancy. A team of CRS attorneys and procedural experts is also assisting the Senate in preparing for an impeachment trial of a Federal district court judge. With high profile treaties on the agenda, CRS will continue its analytical sup-

port of the treaty ratification process. CRS brings a high level of expertise and institutional memory to assist with these essential constitutional responsibilities of the Senate.

Highlights of the past fiscal year illustrate the breadth and depth of services that meet continuing congressional needs for legislative assistance.

As the financial crisis peaked and the U.S. economy continued to stall, CRS experts focused on options for economic stimulus under consideration by Congress: understanding the effectiveness of Federal spending increases, income tax cuts, and the application of monetary policy. During formulation, deliberation, and implementation phases of the stimulus bill, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, analysts assessed how the provisions could provide stimulus, in what ways they could be utilized, and by whom. They addressed debt and deficit issues and measures of economic recovery. As Congress debated measures to address weaknesses of the financial system, CRS supported congressional efforts to reform key elements of consumer finance, including credit card markets, mortgage finance, and predatory lending. Experts studied and reported on systemic risk, resolution of problems of banks deemed too big to fail, mark-to-market accounting, and credit rating agencies. When the effects of the financial downturn began to be felt in other parts of the world, CRS analyzed the impact of the crisis on the European Union, China, Canada, Latin America, and Russia.

The healthcare debate also saw CRS heavily involved in analyzing the various proposals and consulting with Member, committee, and leadership offices. CRS formed a health team with participants from several CRS divisions marshaled to provide a multidisciplinary perspective on this highly complex issue. Our congressional procedures experts also responded to many complicated procedural questions that arose during consideration of legislative proposals. This issue remains a continuing focus of CRS work.

The President also submitted his first nomination to the Supreme Court last year. CRS analysts and information professionals, as in years past, worked closely with Senate Judiciary Committee staff in supporting the advice and consent process. CRS prepared analyses of court of appeals decisions of Judge Sotomayor and developed resources available on our website to assist with the hearings and Senate deliberation of the nomination.

Other congressional concerns required impartial CRS policy analysis, such as the influence of Iran's policies on the security of the Middle East region, Afghanistan stabilization, and the handover of major security missions to Iraqi forces; unemployment compensation, job creation, and training needs resulting from the severity of the recession; food and drug safety; and responses to the potential public health threat of an H1N1 influenza pandemic. Additional examples of support include analysis of environmental and climate change concerns, U.S. energy security and independence; the crisis in the automobile industry and subsequent bankruptcies of large automobile companies and suppliers, the U.S. missile defense program and its technical capabilities, national security issues and military law regarding wartime detainees, and the increase of drug trafficking violence at the U.S.-Mexican border.

CRS management consults with congressional leadership regularly to ensure that the Service's research agenda is aligned with lawmakers' needs. To confirm that CRS remains aligned with the Congress and supportive of its legislative needs, we appreciate your support for engaging outside expert assistance to inform and reinforce our efforts to align our work with the congressional agenda. We recently entered into a contract with LMI, a not-for-profit strategic consulting firm, to evaluate independently CRS's current staffing models and procedures to determine how effectively we are meeting our statutory mandate. LMI has gathered both qualitative and quantitative information from committees, subcommittees, Members and staff and CRS staff. We were proactive in contacting over 3,700 staff members by e-mail before the distribution of a staff survey by LMI to encourage a strong response rate. That effort produced a response rate with a margin of error of less than 3 percent for the data. LMI conducted interviews with Members or senior staff from 15 congressional offices and focus groups with staff from the House and the Senate—all groups selected using a stratified random sample. LMI will also report on best practices for research organizations geared to ensuring responsiveness to client needs, and assess communication channels, including a Member Advisory Committee, that would ensure that CRS remains aligned with the work of the Congress and the needs of its clients. In addition, LMI conducted meetings with CRS staff. We expect their final report in August.

On January 15, 2010, CRS implemented telework for its non-bargaining unit staff, following guidance in the conference report that CRS have in place by January a telework policy modeled on that of the Library. Following negotiations with CREA, the certified bargaining representative, and with the help of a mediator from the

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, we reached a formal agreement on March 26, 2010. We will modify the telework agreement for non-bargaining unit staff so that it conforms to the agreement reached with CREA, and will implement telework for all CRS staff on May 3, 2010. CRS has invested significant resources to set up a robust infrastructure to support those who seek the telework option. I believe that the telework policy implemented for CRS staff provides the benefits to employees of an additional alternative work arrangement. At the same time the policy preserves the ability of CRS to be there when Congress needs us and to remain fully aligned with the legislative agenda and your work patterns.

CRS AS SHARED STAFF

We understand the difficult budget outlook, and CRS is prepared to play its part in arriving at a responsible budget for the next fiscal year that achieves critical agency objectives within a constrained funding environment. Congress faces enormous challenges in fashioning policy on high-profile issues such as health, immigration, the aging population, the conduct of two wars, burgeoning technological advancement, and financial restructuring. In CRS, Congress has at its disposal adjunct staff available to every Member and committee. This means that Member and committee offices need not hire the specialized expertise that CRS is able to retain and make available to all congressional offices and committees as shared staff. In difficult budget times, CRS offers a model that achieves economies and savings and at the same time affords the Congress the expertise and resources it needs to legislate wisely and in an informed manner with respect to the complex issues that confront it and the country.

In that regard, before explaining our budget request, I want to discuss briefly a matter that relates to this model that Congress intended for CRS and the constitutional status of CRS and the Library of Congress. As the Library has already informed you, in February, the Federal district court in *Live365, Inc. v. Copyright Royalty Board*, preliminarily rejected a challenge to the Librarian's authority to appoint Copyright Royalty Judges ruling that it was likely that the Library would prevail on its argument that the Librarian of Congress is the head of a department who may appoint such officers under Article II of the Constitution. The court relied in part on an earlier 1978 case—*Eltra Corp. v. Ringer*—which upheld the Librarian's power to appoint the Register of Copyrights. The judge noted the *Eltra* court's findings that the Library was a hybrid agency with both executive functions (e.g., the Copyright Office's registration function) and legislative functions (e.g., CRS).

I feel that the hybrid formulation captures the original intent of Congress in placing CRS within the Library. Congress extensively debated the relationship between CRS and the Library prior to the creation of the modern CRS in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. At the time, it was thought "the Library serves as a useful mantle for protecting the Service from partisan pressures. Furthermore, the effectiveness of the CRS will be enhanced by its continued instant access to the Library's collections and administrative support services." I believe that that rationale is still valid today and that the model that the Congress devised back in 1970 works. While CRS remains open to any change the Congress deems advisable, the overall relationship whereby Congress' policy research and analysis support arm is housed within the Library of Congress is a valuable one worth preserving.

FISCAL YEAR 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The CRS budget request for fiscal year 2011 is \$119,919,000, with almost 90 percent devoted to pay and benefits for our staff. This request includes funding for mandatory pay increases and price-level increases due to inflation, added staff with specialized technical skills and policy expertise, and an upgraded information architecture supporting ready access to the many and varied data sets required for research. CRS continues to operate at its lowest staff level in more than three decades, and the small percentage of non-pay expenditures is limited to basic operational needs. Therefore it is necessary to request additional funding when investments are needed to expand or upgrade the capabilities of the Service to meet the growing policy demands placed upon Congress.

An internal review of our capabilities to analyze the evolving and increasingly complex challenges facing the Congress identified gaps in the specialized skills needed for comprehensive multidisciplinary analyses and assessments. This budget request includes \$2.8 million for 17 of the 34 FTEs needed to rectify these concerns. Thirteen of these 34 positions would enhance scientific and technical capabilities in areas such as energy, climate change, information technology, military weapons, and security and provide additional expertise in disciplines such as physics, engineering, and biology. Eight positions would provide new skills in analyzing the

healthcare industry, health informatics, and veterans' health. Another eight positions would focus on financial regulatory and oversight issues with expertise in financial accounting and auditing, consumer financial protection, credit markets, and financial derivatives. The remaining five positions would be skilled in labor economics, demography, tax policy, and statistics to support the analyses of issues pertaining to employment, immigration, workforce, and economic well-being. This 2-year targeted increase in staff would require that CRS return to a FTE total that is only four over the level authorized in fiscal year 2007. These experts would have a direct impact on providing all relevant information and analysis needed for informed decisions.

The budget request also includes \$2.1 million to address our need to manage in a more sophisticated way the rapidly growing data necessary for authoritative analysis. We must invest in tools and services to establish an architecture that accommodates changes in technology. With this funding, CRS would create service-wide frameworks for data sets that would allow for efficient access to reliable data and full utilization of its contents. This investment would also allow us to employ modern content delivery capabilities, including interactive maps, data set mining, personalization features such as content tagging, and enhanced access to CRS products from mobile devices. Delays in this investment would cause a decline in efficiency and effectiveness as problems would increase due to technological obsolescence.

CONCLUSION

This budget request identifies the resources needed for the talented and dedicated staff of CRS to provide the full scope of information and analysis that is relevant to the work of Congress. CRS scrutinized the plans for this spending to ensure the returns justified the investment in this period of difficult economic conditions. My colleagues and I have and will continue to examine every activity and program for efficiencies and reduce or eliminate costs where possible while fulfilling our mission. We are proud of our unique role in providing comprehensive, non-partisan, confidential, authoritative, and objective analysis to the Congress, and we thank you for your support.

Thank you.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARYBETH PETERS, REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS, COPYRIGHT OFFICE

Mr. Chairman, Senator Murkowski, and other Members of the Subcommittee: Thank you for the opportunity to present the Copyright Office's fiscal 2011 budget request. Today I will discuss my fiscal 2011 budget request for additional funds and FTEs to support the electronic Copyright Office system and for offsetting authority and FTEs to complete and maintain the Licensing Division Reengineering effort. I will also highlight some of the Office's accomplishments and challenges of fiscal 2009 and 2010.

SUPPORT OF THE UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT SYSTEM

The Copyright Office administers the U.S. copyright law, under which owners of creative works register claims to protect their copyrights, cable and satellite companies and other users of statutory licenses pay royalties related to their statutory licenses, and publishers and other distributors of works published in the United States deposit copies of copyrightable works for possible addition to the Library's collections. Congress enacted the first copyright law in May 1790; in 1870, it centralized the administration of the Federal copyright law in the Library of Congress. The Copyright Office typically handles more than 500,000 copyright claims each year, representing well over one million works, and transfers copies of selected copyrighted works to the Library's collections. In fiscal year 2009, the Office received 532,370 claims to copyright and registered 382,086 claims. It transferred to the Library over 739,000 copies, valued at over \$32.2 million. The Office as a whole answered almost 360,000 non-fee information and reference inquiries and served a substantial number of visitors to the Public Information Office and the Copyright Public Records Reading Room.

The Licensing Division of the Copyright Office receives royalty fee payments related to licenses that deal with secondary transmissions of radio and television programs by cable television systems; secondary transmissions of superstations and network stations by satellite carriers; and the importation, manufacture, and distribution of digital audio recording devices and media. In fiscal 2009, the Licensing Division collected more than \$262 million in royalties from cable and satellite com-

panies subject to statutory licenses, accrued more than \$10.5 million in interest on royalties for the copyright owners, and distributed close to \$273 million to copyright owners. The Office moved forward with reengineering the Licensing Division and building an electronic filing system.

HIGHLIGHTS OF COPYRIGHT OFFICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CHALLENGES

Addressing the Copyright Office Backlog

As discussed in its December 31, 2009 report to you, the Copyright Office has been focusing on reducing the outstanding backlog of applications for copyright registrations. As highlighted in the report, the Copyright Office's backlog reduction efforts are in three key areas: additional staff; improved technology; and increased eService usage. We added over 30 Registration Specialists: 17 in spring 2009 and 16 in January 2010. Those hired in 2009 are now fully productive; the class of 2010 is in training and currently productive in several categories of works. We improved the technology, supporting the processing of serial publications in the fall of 2009, through a combination of new hardware installation and new software. Finally, eService, the online copyright claims submission system, is now the predominant new claims filing method, accounting for over 70 percent of our weekly filings.

In addition, between January and March 2010, the Librarian of Congress provided short term resources to assist in reducing our claims backlog. Fifty-one Library technicians were assigned to this effort, focusing on clearing over 43,000 serials (approximately 10 percent of our processable claims backlog); many television programs and audio books and more than 10,000 pre-screened performing arts/sound recording claims. Through the combined efforts of the Copyright Office and Library staff, and despite weather related closings, we achieved our goal of reducing the backlog by 100,000 claims. The Copyright Office is grateful to the Librarian and the Library as a whole in supporting our efforts to resolve the backlog issues.

Operations Activities

The Copyright Office implemented its business process reengineering project at the end of fiscal 2007 and released eService, the electronic Copyright Office (eCO) online registration system, in July 2008. eService filings quickly displaced the use of paper applications, constituting 54 percent of all claims received for fiscal 2009 and 72 percent for the first quarter of fiscal 2010.

In addition to the backlog reduction work previously discussed, the Copyright Office focused on: long-term strategic improvements to the eCO system; modified its fee schedule; completed preparations for the Copyright Records Digitization Project; and as part of our succession planning effort, established a new leadership training program.

In the Summer of 2009, the Office awarded a contract for major eCO software upgrade that will improve eService user processing, improve Copyright Office throughput time, and in a later version, provide automated statistics to support internal management.

Processes

Through a continuous improvement initiative, the Copyright Office further refined its reengineered processes. For instance, Registration Specialists proposed two changes adopted by the Copyright Office: one resulted in decreasing the time required for the copyright deposit dispatch process; the other led to improved inter-divisional communications, resulting in faster problem resolution. We also examined our mail operation and throughput times in our Receipt, Analysis and Control Division which resulted in improvements in data entry and processing of correspondence. We expect to continue our improvement efforts by identifying additional areas where efficiencies can be achieved.

In August 2009, the Copyright Office adjusted its fee schedule to reflect post-reengineering operational changes. Fees associated with filing copyright claims were adjusted to reflect processing costs, with eService filings remaining at \$35, and paper claims increasing to \$65: a reflection of the increase in the cost of processing paper claims. eService claims are less costly: they do not require data entry and they require fewer quality controls. Other fee services, such as research or certified copies of deposits, were also adjusted to more closely reflect the actual costs of the service.

Organization

As previously mentioned, during fiscal 2009, the Office hired 17 registration specialists. The new hires were immersed in an accelerated training program combining classroom instruction with actual claims processing in the production environment. As of this month, 16 registration specialists achieved independence in

claims processing. A second class of 16 registration specialists was hired in January 2010 and is currently engaged in an accelerated training program. The addition of 32 new registration specialists will significantly increase our production capacity. Recruitment for both groups was extensive, with a special effort made to attract underrepresented populations into our workforce. The interest level was overwhelming, allowing us to select a high caliber of new Registration Specialists.

In mid-2008, the Copyright Office realized the need for a good succession planning program and a corresponding need to implement a leadership training program. In the spring 2009, we launched the Aspiring Leaders Program with an inaugural class of 12 participants. This is a competitive program in which candidates from the across the Copyright Office were selected to participate in a series of education programs focusing on leadership, communications, decisionmaking, and strategic thinking. Participants also had detail opportunities to other Federal agencies including the National Archives, Smithsonian Institution, and offices throughout the Library of Congress. Our goal is to offer this program to other Copyright Office staff on an annual or bi-annual basis.

Information Technology

In fiscal 2009, the Copyright Office continued to make significant improvements to the eCO system through periodic software development releases and hardware installations. The cumulative effects of these actions are better system performance, stability and enhanced functionality for both Office staff and online filers. This included expanding the eService capacity to accommodate up to 500 concurrent users and ensuring its stability through an automatic backup system that will operate if the primary system fails. Also, in November 2009 the Library of Congress Information Technology Service installed a new computer hardware suite that resolved recurring system throughput issues, improving the accessibility of eCO information by the Copyright Office staff.

System improvements are continuing through fiscal 2010 as the Office is engaged in a major eCO upgrade designed to improve eService customer experience, improve Copyright Office throughput time, and in future versions, the automated capability to provide automated statistical software. The project includes an upgrade to the newest version of the software application that drives eCO and the installation of new network hardware. The initial implementation, scheduled for June 2010, will be followed by subsequent releases introducing new system functionality based on feedback elicited from internal and external users. Expected improvements in eCO system performance and functionality will ultimately result in increased production and decreased registration processing times.

For fiscal 2011, the Office seeks approval to hire three new highly skilled IT specialists to provide expertise in the areas of project management, business analysis, requirements definition, and system testing. Providing for more in-house IT support will result in direct and indirect cost savings by reducing reliance on contractors for ongoing maintenance and operations, enhancing our ability to undertake critical projects, improving project and resource management, and improving testing methods.

Copyright Records Digitization Project

We made significant progress on our Copyright Records Digitization Process during fiscal 2009 and early 2010. Based on an extensive analysis of our existing records, we determined that, since 1870, the year the registration function was moved to the Library thereby consolidating the copyright functions in the Library of Congress, 34 distinct processes have been employed to capture and preserve copyright data. Each process, from the large books signed by the A.R. Spofford, the Librarian of Congress in 1870, through the handwritten and typed card catalogue, and even a citizenship certification signed on a playing card, required testing to ensure the best possible image could be captured and stored for preservation and public use.

Based on the analysis, the Copyright Office will undertake the following steps to complete the digitization task and allow full public access to the country's copyright records:

- Complete imaging the Catalog of Copyright Entries (660 volumes). This is a 6 month process and should be completed by the fall 2010;
- Complete imaging of 2.5 million assignment cards. This should also be completed by fall 2010;
- Begin imaging the 49 million card catalogue by catalog series, beginning with the most recent (1977) data and working backward;
- Begin metadata creation for imaged records to ensure public searchability. This is a manual process and must be done for each image; and

—Begin the cross referencing between and integration of imaged records.
I look forward to sharing our progress on this project at future hearings.

Licensing Division Reengineering

In fiscal 2009, the Licensing Division resumed its reengineering efforts, reviewing its current administrative practices and underlying technology, performing a needs analysis for future operations, and beginning to design its re-engineered systems. This included developing an operational baseline, consulting with external stakeholders and preparing the organization for the change process inherent in re-engineering. The goals of this reengineering effort are to: decrease processing times for statements of account by 30 percent or more; implement an online filing process; and to improve public access to Office records. In fiscal 2010 the Congress authorized the Licensing Division to use \$1.1 million from the royalty pools to cover the reengineering costs and associated supporting software. Earlier this month the Office released a Request for Proposal to support this effort. As part of our fiscal 2011 budget request, we requested an additional one time authorization of \$500,000 to cover any unforeseen reengineering expenses. As always, any funds not expended will be returned to the royalty pools. We are also asking for authorization of 2 FTEs and \$285,000 to cover ongoing system costs and maintenance for the new information technology system.

Legal and Policy Activities (Domestic and International)

The Office worked closely with the staff of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on the reauthorization of Section 119 of the Copyright Act, a statutory license available to satellite services for the carriage of certain-over-the-air television signals, which was to expire on December 31, 2009. In 2008 the Office submitted its report to Congress on updating this license as well as two other statutory licenses; this report served as the beginning point of this past year's legislative activities. During the year much discussion ensued and the Senate introduced S. 1670. However, work on this legislation was not completed by the end of last year and since then Congress has enacted several temporary extensions of the section 119 statutory license.

The Office spent significant time during the year evaluating the legal and business implications of the ongoing Google Book Settlement litigation. The Office assisted the Justice Department in preparing its Statement of Interest filed September 18, 2009 for the October fairness hearing. That hearing was postponed when the parties announced that they were amending the settlement agreement to address concerns that had been raised by a wide range of parties. An amended settlement agreement was filed with the court in early November and the fairness hearing was rescheduled for February 18, 2010. The Office once again assisted the Department of Justice with its second Statement of Interest, filed February 4, 2010. Both statements expressed concerns about the effect of the settlement on copyright law and policy and on competition. Additionally, the Office assisted the Justice Department in a number of court cases, including the preparation of amicus briefs filed with the Supreme Court concerning the interpretation of various provisions of the Copyright Act and filings in other cases involving constitutional challenges to the copyright law.

The Omnibus Appropriations Act of 2009 mandated that the Copyright Office prepare a report for Congress on the copyright treatment of pre-1972 sound recordings; this report is due in March 2011. Specifically, the Office has been directed to study the desirability of, and means for, bringing sound recordings fixed before February 15, 1972 under Federal jurisdiction. Sound recordings fixed before February 15, 1972 are governed by state law which in many cases is not well defined. The Federal copyright law allows states to protect these pre-1972 sound recordings until February 15, 2067. Work on this complicated issue is underway, and we expect to meet our deadline.

On the policy front, office attorneys spent considerable time in 2009 examining the ways in which the United States provides copyrighted works in accessible formats to the blind, visually impaired and print-disabled. The Office led an extensive consultation process regarding the operation of the U.S. exception, 17 U.S.C. § 121, generally referred to as the "Chafee Amendment." The Copyright Office website contains the record of this public process. The Office also conducted a day-long public meeting to explore the topics raised in the comments it received. These included: the operation of the Chafee Amendment for the general reading public as well as for students at the K-12 and college levels; the cross-border movement of accessible works for the blind and visually impaired; the role of technology; the role of trusted intermediaries; and existing systems for providing accessible versions of copyrighted works to the blind. The Office has worked diligently with other U.S. Government agencies in preparing for and attending meetings of the World Intellectual Property

Organization's (WIPO) Standing Committee on Copyright, which has this issue on its agenda. The Office is currently working with the Library's National Library Service for the Blind, as well as with advocates for the blind and other stakeholders to explore ways to improve standards, resources and responsible cross border movement of works in accessible formats. Finally, during the week of March 8, the Office and the WIPO sponsored an international training program at the Library of Congress. The program focused on exceptions for the blind in the United States and other countries and consideration of a series of timely questions about resources, technical standards and market solutions designed to improve accessibility in the digital world, an area in which the United States has long been a leader. Attending were representatives of developing countries and countries in transition as well as experts from various parts of the world. Speakers included government and private sector experts from the United States and other countries. Staff from the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House spoke on "Copyright Policy on Capitol Hill."

Additionally, the Copyright Office assisted Federal government agencies with many multilateral, regional and bilateral negotiations and served on many U.S. delegations, including negotiations regarding a proposed Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement and negotiations and meetings relating to the implementation of intellectual property provisions of existing Free Trade Agreements and Trade Promotion Agreements. The Copyright Office also participated as part of the U.S. delegation at various meetings of the WIPO.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I ask you to support the Office's fiscal 2011 budget request for two FTEs and additional offsetting authority to complete and maintain the Licensing Division Reengineering efforts and additional FTEs to provide long-term support for eCO, our information technology system.

I also want to thank you for your past support of the Copyright Office re-engineering efforts and its budget requests.

Senator NELSON. Ambassador O'Keefe.

Thank you, Dr. Billington.

STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR JOHN O'KEEFE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER

Ambassador O'KEEFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Murkowski, Senator Pryor. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the Open World Leadership Center's fiscal year 2011 budget request.

As a unique congressional center and resource, Open World is the dynamic catalyst for hundreds of international projects and partnerships that constituents have developed with emerging leaders from the countries of Eurasia. More than 6,000 volunteer American families in all 50 States have hosted 15,500 young professionals. More than 75 percent of Open World's fiscal year 2009 appropriation was expended on U.S.-based goods and services.

Our U.S. hosts immersed these professionals in American life and values, contributing \$1.9 million in cost shares. American volunteer hosts have enthusiastically stepped forward, keeping the demand for 2010 visitors at nearly triple our supply.

In the past year, we have intensified our continuing efforts toward working with Senators, Representatives, and their staffs in coordinating programs with civic organizations in towns across America. We have doubled the number of Members of Congress who have met with our delegates. The Open World Board of Trustees has also directed the Center to draft a new strategic plan with goals that will engage Members of Congress and their constituents even more.

We brought delegates from all 83 regions of Russia, all parts of Ukraine, from the Caucasus and central Asia. They now constitute 10 percent of the Russian Duma, one-third of the Council of

Judges, and are the engines for change in fields from education to medicine.

In the security sphere, for example, a Georgian Open World participant has been promoted to be his country's first "cybersecurity czar." As he crafts Georgia's strategy to thwart the emerging threat of cyber attacks, he has reconnected with Department of Homeland Security experts that he met on our program.

In a very recent example, a Kyrgyz parliamentarian, whom the Montana Senate majority leader both hosted in Helena and then visited in Bishkek, is one of the leaders writing the new constitution in Kyrgyzstan right now following the April revolution.

Open World offers an extraordinary "bang for the buck" in terms of efficiency, cost effectiveness, and value. The Center boasts an overhead rate of 7 percent, and every grant contains cost-shared elements. Unfortunately, to keep costs down, I had to let go one of our nine staff here in Washington.

Funding at the \$14 million level requested by the Board of Trustees will enable the Center to resume its important nonproliferation program, bringing nuclear experts to enhance working relationships not covered by other programs. We will expand to Armenia, Uzbekistan, and Belarus and will fund a full-time development expert.

With your support, Americans throughout the United States will engage a promising new generation of political and civic leaders—parliamentarians, mayors, environmentalists, anti-human trafficking activists, and others—in a dialogue that has, for example, doubled the number of Rotary Clubs throughout the regions we operate in and created 20 sister courts.

PREPARED STATEMENT

This unprecedented congressional program has proven to be an exciting vehicle for linking grassroots professionals and emerging leaders. It helps create more transparent and accountable governments and expands cooperative arrangements between America and Eurasia.

Thank you very much for your attention.
[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR JOHN O'KEEFE

Mr. Chairman, Senator Murkowski, and other Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to present testimony on the Open World Leadership Center's budget request for fiscal year 2011. The Open World Leadership Center, of which I am the Executive Director, is a unique congressional center that is a resource for Members of Congress and their staff and constituents. It seeks to assist Congress in its foreign policy oversight responsibilities and aid Congress in inter-parliamentary and similar legislative activities. In this capacity, the Center conducts one of the largest U.S. exchange programs for Eurasia, through which some 6,100 volunteer American families in all 50 states have hosted thousands of emerging leaders from former Soviet countries. As a result of these exchanges, hundreds of projects and partnerships beneficial to all have been initiated and enhanced. All of us at the Center are very grateful for Congress' continued support, and to the Members of Congress who participate in the Center's Open World program and who serve on our governing board. We look forward to working with you, other Members of Congress, congressional interest groups, and volunteer hosts throughout the United States to set the future path of Open World.

The Board of Trustees suggested that the Center seek greater congressional involvement in the Open World program and develop a strategic plan that makes our agency an even more valuable resource for the legislative branch. I am pleased to

share with you that nearly one out of two program participants in 2009—48 percent—met with Members of Congress or their staff. When our board convened on February 4, 2010, we discussed important legislative components of a new strategic plan for 2012–2016, and I look forward to sharing these components with you as we develop them.

Allow me to update you on the Center’s operations and some recent program accomplishments. More than 15,000 emerging leaders from Russia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Lithuania, and Uzbekistan have participated in Open World. Significantly, more than 48 million Muslims reside in countries where Open World is active, and these countries have approximately 2,000 miles of shared borders with Iran and Afghanistan.

Since its inception, the Center has awarded grants for overseeing our U.S. exchanges to 60 organizations headquartered in 25 different states and the District of Columbia. These grantee organizations host delegations themselves or award subgrants to local host organizations to do so. By 2010, well over 600 local host organizations—including universities and community colleges, Rotary clubs and other service organizations, sister-city associations, and international visitor councils and other nonprofits in all 50 states and the District of Columbia—had conducted Open World exchanges for the Center.

More than 75 percent of Open World’s fiscal year 2009 appropriated funds were expended on U.S. goods and services through contracts and grants—much of it at the local community level. American volunteers in 48 states and the District of Columbia home hosted Open World participants in calendar year 2009, contributing a large portion of the estimated \$1.9 million given to the program in the form of cost shares.

In fiscal year 2010, Open World had a 14 percent reduction in appropriated funds. As a consequence, Open World terminated one of its most important but costliest programs, the nonproliferation exchange program for Russian nuclear experts and decision makers. Nevertheless, through cost shares, contract renegotiations, donations, and an interagency transfer, the Center was able to maintain the quality of the Open World program as well as to double the number of participants from the Republic of Georgia.

The Center’s budget request of \$14 million for fiscal year 2011 was reviewed by our Board of Trustees. We will seek to fulfill our Board-approved strategic plan to expand to Armenia, Uzbekistan, and Belarus, as well as to bolster our development efforts. At this level, we will bring 1,400 participants in calendar year 2011. We estimate that, again, more than 75 percent of the appropriated funds will be spent on U.S. goods and services, including nearly \$4.5 million in direct grants to American host organizations. The funds will allow thousands of Americans throughout the United States and their counterparts abroad to generate hundreds of new projects and partnerships and other concrete results.

OPEN WORLD PROGRAM RESULTS

There are many examples of solid, productive results from the Open World program:

A Moscow principal who is pioneering inclusive education at her school instituted new curriculum activities for her students with disabilities—and became an advocate for Individualized Education Programs for special-needs students—after her 2008 Open World education exchange to Worcester, Massachusetts. Russian President Dmitry Medvedev met with this alumna and toured her institution on September 1, 2009, the first day of the Russian school year. The Russian president was impressed by the curriculum additions and by the alumna’s point that inclusive schools like hers do not receive any government funding to defray the cost of the extra services provided to special-needs children. President Medvedev said he would have the Ministry of Education look into this funding issue and praised the alumna’s school for being in the vanguard of inclusive education. The school visit was covered by three national TV channels.

In agribusiness, a Moldovan alumnus, Dr. Gheorghe Arpentin, commenced a series of Skype online lectures recently at the request of North Carolina grape growers, many of whom have recently converted their fields into grape vineyards. The first lecture, on using organic viticulture, was well received; Dr. Arpentin’s recommendations were referred by members of the North Carolina Wine and Grape Council to North Carolina State University, where they are now being field tested on North Carolina soils for prospective application. Dr. Arpentin was recently named a deputy minister of agriculture. His second lecture is scheduled for late April 2010.

This is what one of the American participants in Dr. Arpentin's first Skype class had to say:

"The SKYPE Lecture on Grape Growing by Dr. Arpentin from Moldova was exactly what we needed. We Americans tend to reach for 'chemicals' to increase our crop productions. Dr. Arpentin directed us to 'go natural with use of select rotated wild grasses' which will increase our yield, decrease bitterness of the grape, maximize plumpness and yes, save us money. With Moldova's 3,000 year history of successful grape growing and wine making and with Moldova's awards in the field, I listened closely and learned."

In an example touching on U.S. security interests, Open World Georgian delegates involved in drafting their country's personal data protection act met in November 2009 with House Energy and Commerce Committee staff members working on H.R. 2221, the Data Accountability and Trust Act, to discuss and compare their legislative provisions. Upon returning home, one of the delegates became the director of the Georgian Ministry of Justice's Data Exchange Agency, which is responsible for the nation's cybersecurity and e-government program. He continues to communicate with those he met on Open World, including representatives from the Department of Homeland Security's Computer Emergency Readiness Team and congressional staffers.

At the Civil Society Summit held in Moscow last July in conjunction with the U.S.-Russian Presidential Summit, 12 of the 75 American and Russian attendees were Open World partners. All 12 now serve on working groups for the U.S.-Russian Bilateral Presidential Commission, which was created as a result of the presidential summit to explore new opportunities for U.S.-Russian partnership. In January 2010, a Russian alumnus was invited back to Washington, DC, where he had spent much of his 2008 Open World visit, to participate in the inaugural meeting of the Commission's civil society working group. The alumnus, who heads a nongovernmental organization (NGO) that aids homeless, exploited, and at-risk children and teens in Astrakhan Region, is an authority on child welfare issues, a major focus of the working group's first meeting. He is also active in advocating for Russia to create a counterpart agency to the Virginia-based National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, which he first learned about—and visited—during his Open World exchange. This same alumnus was just appointed to and made chairman of the Astrakhan city election commission.

Open World alumni are continuing to climb up the ladder into leadership positions while bringing about changes from the periphery in and the bottom up. The Open World Leadership Center tracks these and other such results using eight categories, or "bins," such as partnerships with Americans, alumni projects inspired by the Open World experience, and benefits to Americans. Since launching a results database in August 2007, Open World has identified more than 3,000 results (see attached Results Chart).

OPEN WORLD AND CONGRESS

As a U.S. Legislative Branch entity, the Open World Leadership Center links Congress to experienced and enthusiastic citizens throughout the United States who are engaged in projects and programs in Open World countries, and actively supports the foreign relations initiatives of Congress. The Open World program routinely involves Members in its hosting activities and is responsive to congressional priorities. Seven of the 18 congressional members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission) met with Open World delegates last year. The Center also regularly consults with the Congressional Georgia Caucus, the Congressional Ukrainian Caucus, the Russia Caucus, the Congressional Azerbaijan Caucus, the Congressional Caucus on Central Asia, the Friends of Kazakhstan Caucus, other congressional entities, and individual Members with specific interests in Open World countries or thematic areas.

Some examples of Member and congressional staff interaction with Open World in 2009 and early 2010 are:

—In February 2009, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Ranking Member Richard Lugar of Indiana met with four Turkmen parliamentary deputies taking part in Open World, including International and Interparliamentary Affairs Committee Chairman Batyr Berdyev. They were able to compare notes on legislative jurisdiction, schedules, campaigning, and staffing with Senator Lugar. The group also discussed how the United States and Turkmenistan are dealing with the global economic crisis, and briefly reviewed Turkmenistan's proposal in the U.N. General Assembly to create an international security system for transnational energy pipelines.

- In October 2009, five Tajik journalists visiting Connecticut joined Senator Christopher Dodd at the award ceremony for the Thomas J. Dodd Prize in International Justice and Human Rights. The award was presented to the Committee to Protect Journalists and the delegates had the opportunity to talk about issues related to the freedom of press with the senator and other journalists at the event.
 - In January 2010, Congressman David Price of North Carolina hosted a group of Moldovan parliamentarians in Raleigh and then in Washington, DC. The group's visit coincided with that of Moldovan Prime Minister Vlad Filat to both of these cities in order to further cement sister-state relations between North Carolina and Moldova. The Moldovan delegates proposed and discussed the idea of forming a North Carolina Caucus in their parliament.
 - In September 2009, Texas Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison met with an Open World delegation of Kazakhstani women leaders, including Bakhyt Syzdykova, Kazakhstan's youngest member of parliament. Representative Robert Aderholt of Alabama, a cochair of the Friends of Kazakhstan Caucus, also met with Syzdykova and discussed the idea of establishing a relationship between the Alabama Youth Legislature and the Kazakh Youth Parliament. Since then, we have begun making plans to bring regional coordinators for the Kazakh Youth Parliament to Alabama on an Open World exchange.
 - Pennsylvania Representative Allyson Schwartz, cochair of the Congressional Georgia Caucus, met in November with Georgian parliamentarians to discuss opportunities for future collaboration with the Caucus, and Georgia's geopolitical situation.
 - Open World partnered with the International Conservation Caucus Foundation in co-hosting the visit of Russian environmental leaders. Senators Tom Udall of New Mexico and Sheldon Whitehouse of Rhode Island met with the delegation, which included representatives of the Russian Duma, to discuss issues related to preserving endangered species and protecting the environment.
 - Open World arranged meetings with alumni leaders for the members of a Senate staff delegation during their late August-early September visit to Moldova, Georgia, and Russia. In Moldova, the congressional staff delegation met with mayors who had been hosted in North Carolina in 2007 on Open World. During this meeting, the staff delegation presented the mayors with letters of greeting from North Carolina State Representative Larry Brown and Winston-Salem Mayor Allen Joines, who had both taken part in the Moldovan mayors' Open World visit.
 - At the invitation of Chairman Eni Faleomavaega of the House Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment, Open World Executive Director John O'Keefe participated in December in a roundtable discussion with high-ranking Kazakhstani government officials about their country's human rights record and chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.
- Open World plans to build on these congressional partnerships and to be even more active in serving Congress.

NONAPPROPRIATED OPEN WORLD FUNDING

The Center, which is authorized to receive contributions from private sources, has redoubled its efforts to seek a wide range of supporters to increase and further diversify funding and strengthen the Open World program through cost-share partnerships. The major sources of nonappropriated funding are direct contributions from foundations and individuals, interagency transfers of funds, cost shares from Open World grantees and American hosts, and other forms of in-kind contributions, especially for Open World's alumni program, which receives no appropriated funds.

In an effort to track the very generous in-kind support Open World receives from grantees and American citizens, the Center in 2007 initiated a cost-share reporting requirement for all grantees participating in the program. We received \$1.7 million in donated goods and services from hosts and grantees in 2008—equal to 19 percent of the Center's fiscal year 2008 appropriation. While the exact figure for 2009 will not be available until later this spring, early estimates indicate it will be near \$1.9 million.

As an example of cost shares from grantees, Supporters of Civil Society in Russia (SCSR), the American partner of the prestigious Moscow School of Political Studies (MSPS), contributed \$95,000 worth of lodging, meals, interpretation services, and other goods and services—53 percent of the total U.S. programming cost—to bring one group of 20 emerging Russian leaders nominated by MSPS to St. Louis, Missouri, in April 2009 and another group of 28 to Chicago, Illinois, in October 2009

for intensive accountable governance programming. Open World awarded a 2010 grant to SCSR to host again in both these locations with a similar cost share.

Concurrently, Open World actively seeks donations from private sources. In 2009, Open World Trustee Walter Scott made a 3-year pledge of \$525,000 from his family foundation to support Open World programs. Under the expert guidance of our development consultant, the Center is also approaching other individuals and organizations interested in the region.

Reciprocal visits by Americans to Open World alumni help fulfill Open World's mission of strengthening peer-to-peer ties and partnerships. These visits by American professionals, hosts, or grantees involved in Open World are self-funded. For example, in May 2009, eight representatives of the League of Women Voters, an Open World grantee organization, traveled to Moscow, Kaluga, and St. Petersburg, Russia, and discussed electoral processes and women's political leadership with more than 25 alumni who had been hosted by various chapters of the League. Numerous U.S. judges and legal experts involved with Open World exchanges also make independently financed reciprocal trips to meet with program alumni. In 2009, American jurists involved with Open World's rule of law program made 59 reciprocal professional visits to Open World countries to meet with program alumni and senior judicial leaders to discuss judicial reform.

Direct contributions from individuals, foundations, and other private sources during the same time period totaled more than \$400,000. A fiscal 2009 interagency agreement with the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) supported all the hosting costs (up to \$500,000) of the Russian Cultural Leaders Program.

Finally, the Center has temporarily engaged the services of a development consultant. In tandem with helping define and update our strategic goals and agency mission statement, this specialist will help the Center establish an in-house capacity for fundraising.

OPEN WORLD 2010 ACTIVITIES, 2011 PLANS, AND 2012–2016 STRATEGIC PLANNING

Interest in the Open World program remains vibrant within the American hosting community. The “demand” for Open World visitors from Russia in 2010 is more than double the “supply”—potential American grantees applied to host up to 1,816 Russian participants, while the Center will only have funding to bring 750 to the United States. For the 2010 Ukraine program, demand was triple the supply of available hosting slots, and for Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan, potential grantees proffered a total of 1,158 hosting slots, while Open World can afford to host only 314 visitors from these seven countries.

Open World continues this year to host in thematic areas that advance U.S. national interests in general, and congressional interests in particular, and that generate concrete results while strengthening the ties between American communities and their partners abroad. This programming emphasizes and builds on Open World's incremental successes in such areas as governance (focusing on the legislative branch's role in helping to bring about good governance and affecting public policy), the rule of law, human-trafficking prevention and prosecution, and environmental issues. This year Open World will also increase its non-Russian programming to approximately 46 percent of its total programming, which is double Open World's 2007 level of non-Russian programming.

One example that demonstrates Open World's commitment to supporting existing partnerships and initiatives is our involvement with the 15-year-old relationship between Maryland and Russia's Leningrad Region. Open World has sponsored 14 Leningrad-Region delegation visits to Maryland since 2002, helping this sister-state partnership work on such substantive areas as accountable governance, education, social services, and the rule of law.

In turn, the State of Maryland has funded reciprocal visits to Russia. In August 2009, a delegation of Maryland educators led by the director of international affairs of the Maryland Secretary of State's Office visited Leningrad Region. Then in December, an official Maryland Sister States delegation met in Russia with over 40 Open World alumni associated with this partnership and worked with government officials to nominate an Open World delegation of Leningrad regional legislators.

These regional legislators were hosted for Open World in January 2010 by the Maryland Secretary of State's Office. The delegation spent much of its time in the Maryland legislature, focusing on how a state-level legislature functions and on the legislative process. Other programming covered such topics as legislative advocacy, lobbying, ethics, state taxation and fiscal structure, and economic development.

The Center will also continue women as leaders programs, like the one planned in April 2010 for a delegation of women parliamentarians from Kyrgyzstan and

Kazakhstan. Their programs will focus on women's issues, with the Kyrgyzstani leaders participating in Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson's Women's Peace Initiative in Dallas, Texas, and the Kazakhstani leaders being hosted in Illinois by Congresswoman Debbie Halvorson.

In 2010 and 2011, the Center will actively seek to host more regional legislators—especially legislators from Central Asia and the Caucasus, based on congressional interest. We will have a large pool of newly elected regional legislators to draw from. Rule of law programming for Open World countries whose judiciaries demonstrate continued movement towards independence will also have a focus. Finally, with Board approval and in consultation with the Appropriations Committees, the Center is prepared in 2011 to expand the Open World program into other countries.

By the end of this fiscal year, the Center will have finalized a new strategic plan spanning 2012–2016 with a focus on making the Center an even more valuable resource for Congress and its constituents. There will be in-depth program changes to increase congressional involvement in Open World and focused efforts to provide support to the constituent hosts who have established programs and partnerships in Open World countries. The Board, in its preliminary discussion of the new Strategic Plan, suggested considering the following:

- Ensuring that a substantial portion of future program participants are legislators, either at the national, regional or local level.
- Engaging more Members of Congress to host Open World parliamentarians.
- Increasing the percentage of Open World delegations that meet with Members of Congress, congressional entities, and/or congressional staff to discuss issues of relevance to both sides.
- Ensuring that every delegation gains a working understanding of the role of the U.S. Congress and state and local legislatures in government operations.
- Adding subthemes to Open World programming to highlight how citizens and interest groups work to affect the legislative process at the Federal, state, and local levels.

FISCAL YEAR 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

Funding at the requested level of \$14 million will enable the Center to fully respond to congressional interests in the region and beyond while continuing its proven mission of hosting young political and civic leaders who return home to launch projects and programs in cooperation with their American counterparts and hosts. The Board of Trustees believes that maintaining a robust grassroots-based Open World presence in the region is necessary and important for future U.S. relations in these politically significant countries.

The budget request, in conjunction with projected donations and cost shares, will also allow the Center to increase hosting to a level of approximately 1,400 total participants. Actual allocations of participant slots to individual countries will be based on Board of Trustees recommendations and consultations with the Subcommittee and the U.S. Embassies in these countries. The requested funding will also help offset an expected decrease in prior year recovered funds and Trust revenue income.

Major categories of requested funding are:

- Personnel Compensation and Benefits and other operating expenses (\$1.73 million);
- Contracts (\$7.8 million—awarded to U.S.-based entities) that include:
 - Coordinating the delegate nomination and vetting process,
 - Obtaining visas and other travel documents,
 - Arranging and paying for air travel,
 - Coordinating with grantees and placing delegates,
 - Providing temporary health insurance for participants; and
- Grants (\$4.47 million—awarded to U.S. host organizations) that include the cost of providing:
 - Professional programming for delegates,
 - Meals outside of those provided by home hosts,
 - Community activities,
 - Local transportation,
 - Professional interpretation,
 - Administrative support.

CONCLUSION

In an increasingly connected world, where citizen ambassadors on Main Street are conducting important work in the sphere of public diplomacy, Open World gives community leaders a unique institutional base in the legislative branch for partnering with Congress while providing them with the resources to succeed. As

Dr. James Billington, chairman of the Open World Board of Trustees, stated at the annual Board meeting on February 4, 2010:

“Citizen diplomacy is becoming much more important. In an increasingly connected world, it is not just State Department officials but North Carolina farmers who now have access to a deputy minister in Moldova. And the Federal judge who hosts counterparts in Kentucky is now in direct contact with a supreme court justice in Ukraine. The secretary of state from Maine regularly exchanges emails with the mayor of Arkhangelsk, Russia. Open World helps create these and thousands more lines of communication.”

Open World offers an extraordinary “bang for the buck” in terms of efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and value. The Center boasts an overhead rate of about 7 percent, every grant contains cost-shared elements, and more than 75 percent of our appropriation is plowed back into the American economy every year. At the local level, where the funds and the jobs are most needed, our delegates, as part of their “after hours” Open World experience, participate in American life at local restaurants, cultural sites, sporting events, shopping centers, and other places in the community. During the professional portion of their local program, they not only benefit from working with their American counterparts, but also share their own expertise in turn. In this way, the Center is both a mini-stimulus plan as well as a true international exchange program.

Funding the 2011 Open World program at the requested level of \$14 million will allow Americans in hundreds of Congressional Districts throughout the United States to engage up-and-coming Eurasian political and civic leaders—such as parliamentarians, environmentalists, and anti-human trafficking activists—in projects and ongoing partnerships. Americans will, once again, open their doors and give generously to help sustain this successful congressional program that focuses on a region of profound interest to U.S. foreign policy. To that end, the Subcommittee’s interest and support have been essential ingredients in Open World’s success.

Senator NELSON. Thank you.

Why don’t we go to a 6-minute round of questions?

ACQUISITION STRATEGY AND STORAGE COSTS

Two years ago, at our request, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) looked at the Library’s management of its collections. One of their recommendations was that the Library develop a Library-wide strategy for making its collection available in electronic form, both as a means of providing greater access to its collections, as well as a substitute for physical storage.

Now I heard what you said, Dr. Billington, about making certain that the original copies are available because of the potential of altering anything that is digitized. Is there any way that we can find to be able to overcome the costs of the actual storage of such materials? For example, is it possible to have, in some cases at least, fees for the ability to do that?

I know in the case of copyright, the Copyright Office is self-sustaining in terms of the copyright fees. But that doesn’t include the storage, ultimate storage, which is what is creating the challenge for us, one of the challenges that we have right now.

So it is a broad question, but is there a way to overcome this situation because it is driving up our storage costs?

Dr. BILLINGTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, in terms of exploring cost recovery as a factor, I know you have mentioned that to us, and I have already asked the staff to prepare a careful study of that. So we will get back to you in detail on that.

On the question of storage, our authorizing committee asked us to look into this, and we found the company in the private sector that may be most analogous to the Library in terms of the volume of storage that they contend with and the issue of storage overall.

Their engineers are specialists in this. This is Amazon we are talking about.

Their people concluded that no meaningful solution for long-term effective collection management can be implemented until more space is created; that there is no realistic alternative. I could go into the reasons for this in detail.

The modules at Fort Meade are enormously efficient for this purpose because of their size and ultimate scale. They contain enormous amounts of material already. But we add 2, 2.5 million analog items every year, even in the face of the digital explosion. There we have a shared program, national program with the many other institutions that I mentioned.

ADDITIONAL SPACE FOR COLLECTIONS ESSENTIAL

But there really is no alternative to having more space, and that was confirmed, as I say, by experts, objective experts in the private sector. There is danger in our current circumstance of having 200,000 books that are on the floor of the stacks now because we are at full capacity on Capitol Hill, despite the fact that we have shelving that reaches almost from here to Chicago, somewhere between Detroit and Chicago, if you put the shelves end to end. We are the only comprehensive collection of its kind in the world.

Maintaining, not merely acquiring these things, but having them inventoried and accessible, becomes very, very difficult when you get this much new material in and there is no place to put it. You have a situation where you are going to be tempted to severely cut back on acquisitions. We are studying acquisitions, as you suggest. We did a very exhaustive study a couple of years ago, and we are now taking a comprehensive, fresh look at it.

But there is a danger, if there is a gap in acquisitions, that the most recent things later will be more and more difficult to acquire and to afford and to make accessible. And that reduces the value of your collection by more than just one year's missing or reduced capacity, because the gaps pile up, and pretty soon, you lose what is an enormous advantage to the United States—not just to the Library of Congress and to the Congress and the Government itself—of having a collection that is comprehensive.

Because we include in our collections items that nobody else acquires, and all other libraries and other research libraries in this country are under even more severe restrictions than we are these days, whether it is from the university, municipal, or State budgets. And so, maintaining the Library of Congress as the “library of last resort,” as the library that is able to answer questions that cannot be fully answered elsewhere, even by the vast amount of digital material that is available, is very important.

RECOUPING COPYRIGHT STORAGE COSTS

Senator NELSON. Well, what about going to the area of copyright where you could not only get the copyright processing covered, but the ultimate storage as well?

Dr. BILLINGTON. Yes. Well, copyright storage is included in the fee costs. Costs and fees are reevaluated every third year. So it is actually a part of the fee computation to include at least a percentage of the storage cost.

There is some relief in sight in copyright despite problems we have had. We undertook a massive effort to bring the processing backlog under control; 50 people worked to help overcome these backlogs. But now 75 percent of registrations are processed electronically, and so that should help a great deal.

But all collections, of course, do not come through copyright. Copyright is only one source. We have gifts. We have exchanges. We receive collections material in a variety of different ways and, of course, through very extensive purchasing. We have the overseas offices as a source not just for us, but for any other research library in America that wants to seriously keep up their foreign language collections.

But the margin between what the Library of Congress provides and what any other institution provides is growing rather than declining. Therefore, the need to sustain this national resource is, I think, growing even faster than the necessary costs of sustaining it.

Senator NELSON. Thank you.

Senator Murkowski.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

TWITTER ARCHIVE

Dr. Billington, I would like to ask you about the new media. You mentioned that the number of volumes, I guess, out there is just growing exponentially, and we recognize that there is another world out there that is growing insofar as the level of communication. And I understand that earlier this month, the Library of Congress entered into a gift arrangement with Twitter to donate its digital archive of the public Tweets to the Library.

A couple of questions for you. First of all, I am just coming into the world of Twitter and using it to keep in touch with my constituents. But the question that I would have to you first is a pretty basic one. How will the Library use this information? What will the purpose be?

And then, second, how do you retain this archive of Tweets, recognizing just how much is out there? Will you archive the Tweets to the Library on an annual, quarterly basis? How do you update this digital information, recognizing the rate with which it will be coming to you?

And then, finally, I am curious to know how we deal with the cost side of it. I assume that because the archive of public Tweets was donated that there is no initial cost to the Library, but I would have to imagine that there would be some cost associated with receiving or organizing.

So if you could just speak to this, I am very curious. It seems like you are embarking into a bold new world where no man hath gone before. So more power to you, but it is kind of interesting to understand how we would integrate this within the Library of Congress.

Dr. BILLINGTON. Well, the short answer is there are some short-run surprises, happy surprises in the answer to your question, and there are some long-run questions that we will be in the process of intensively examining over the next few months.

A short-run surprise is that, first of all, this is a gift, and the preparation and delivery of it will be done by the Twitter company themselves. Twitter will bear the cost of preparing and transferring it to the Library's servers. I am surprised but also reassured that the cost to technically support the collection will be very minimal because we can absorb it in our existing infrastructure—the basic technical infrastructure.

ACCESS TO TWITTER COLLECTION

Our cost of taking and storing the archive then will be minimal, but we will need to look into how to catalogue it, how to make it retrievable, while addressing privacy needs and how we make it accessible—this is a classic acquisitions problem. How we make it available would be defined by our basic acquisitions policy. These are all challenges that we will be addressing intensively in the next months. So far, for the initial period, this is really pretty much a gift that we can accommodate.

How we make it available, how we deal with it, that is important not simply as it relates to this one collection. It is important because this is not going to be the last of the technological innovations. In order to continue our historic mission of acquiring, preserving, and making accessible the world's knowledge and the Nation's creativity, we must incorporate these new media.

And something else, this process of studying new technologies and ways to make them available is part of our relating much more intensively the new digital world to the basic world of acquisitions and the core mission, the historic mission. There has been no change to the mission of the Library. The media through which knowledge and information and creativity in America are conveyed are going to change and keep on changing.

We feel that the process of integrating the Twitter collection and finding out exactly how we use it, how we access it, and so forth will be a useful learning process for the next few changes and innovations. Otherwise we fall behind and become less comprehensive than this institution has historically aspired to be ever since it acquired Jefferson's then virtually universal library in 16 languages.

So this is a new language, if you like. I can't tell you the answer, but I can assure you that we are going to be looking into these problems very intensively and will be informing this subcommittee and others here in the Congress of our discoveries and conclusions.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, as you point out, this is just kind of the beginning of the acquisition of the social networking media. And it will be a challenge.

FORT MEADE AND COMPETING PRIORITIES

I want to go back, just very quickly if I can, to the storage issue that the chairman has raised, and particularly collection storage Module 5 at Fort Meade. In order to fund this at \$16.9 million and recognizing that we are trying to balance the priorities out here, we have got to balance the Library's request with the AOC's request and each of the other agencies within the legislative branch, are there any other increases within your budget that you could perhaps delay so that you could move forward?

Because I understand that this is the number one priority is the storage collection Module 5. And first of all, I guess I want to make sure that I am correct in that, that this is that high priority. And if so, is there anything else that, again, could be delayed in terms of taking it up this year so that we could help address this aspect of the storage?

Dr. BILLINGTON. Well, there is not much question of the Library's priority. It is clear that in terms of the things that the Architect of the Capitol (AOC) is requesting with regard to the Library that this is by far the top priority because this affects core mission and continuity. We are 8 years behind in the schedule that was agreed to way back in the 1990s. And so, this is our priority in the Architect of the Capitol request.

Now within our own budget, I have been talking with the Executive Committee in view of the concern about levels of funding. I would say that we have to have as our first priority sustaining core services—the mandatory pay raises and price level increases. I can give you a detailed scenario, if you want it, in writing.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, if you would help us out with that, Dr. Billington, and I know it is difficult to rank, if you will. But I think it is going to be important to us. I think we appreciate that from the perspective of being able to meet your core mission, you have got to have the storage capacity. You have indicated that the backlog, the 8-year delay in this, and we appreciate that.

But if you could perhaps help us out, put it in writing, I think that that would be helpful for the subcommittee.

Dr. BILLINGTON. Okay. Well, we will be happy to do that.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

Dr. BILLINGTON. In general, I can say that if we have to, if we have to balance that against our budget submission, or if we have to absorb the cost of living allowances (COLAs), the mandatory COLAs and so forth, we would have to cut, in some cases perhaps even eliminate, some of the other things that we have done in recent years. We have already looked very intensively at the possibilities, and we would have to probably reenter any such programmatic cuts for funding in the 2012 Federal budget.

We have not considered training for cuts; with minimal funding we have produced some training programs to get the most out of our people. It would be largely people and the people-centered things that we would have to preserve. The demands, when you have so many fewer people than we have had, really are very great, and the need for continuous training, because of the sophisticated nature of our work, is very great.

Our Chief Operating Officer has played an important role in developing some of these programs. I can itemize them for you, but we will get you a detailed study if you want—

Senator MURKOWSKI. I would appreciate it.

Dr. BILLINGTON [continuing]. Of how we would proceed.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

Dr. BILLINGTON. As I say, it is in process. So we should be able to give that to you fairly rapidly.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator NELSON. Yes, thank you, Senator Murkowski.

MANDATORY PAY INCREASES

At the risk of being indelicate, would you explain the mandatory COLAs? If we don't have a union contract, what would be mandatory about COLAs or salary increases? Not suggesting that people shouldn't expect salary increases, but help me understand the structure that you are talking about.

Dr. BILLINGTON. Well, yes, 90 percent of this is absolutely mandatory by law, and the rest is more or less required. It is very difficult to avoid it. We have very little discretion, except in the senior level.

I don't have the authority to withhold or change pay adjustments for the 90 percent and really can't do it for most of the rest, except for maybe senior-level pay, which we wouldn't cut. It won't save you very much.

Anyhow, I can provide more detailed legal information if you would like. We have looked into this quite extensively.

Senator NELSON. Yes, it would be helpful to understand that because that was a new concept to me. I didn't realize—I didn't believe there was a union agreement. But if there is statutory responsibility, we obviously have to follow it. I would just like to know what it is. It would be helpful.

Oh, yes?

Ms. JENKINS. I just want to add that it isn't necessarily union agreements, but under title V, employees who are in GS or wage grade positions are automatically entitled to certain increases. That represents 90 percent of our staff. So the other 10 percent would be senior management, which is not mandatory. But for 90 percent, under title V, it is covered, according to our counsel.

COLLECTION POLICIES AND COST

Senator NELSON. I understand. Okay. Thank you.

I am intrigued by the access of the Tweets through a gift. I would imagine that the costs, while not necessarily involving the storage, would come from trying to figure out how to have access, protect the right to privacy, and that. Do you have any idea or do you have anyone looking at what that might involve in terms not simply of activity, but what the costs of putting that kind of a program in place is because we would be talking about something fairly sophisticated, I would assume?

Dr. BILLINGTON. Yes, the material won't be delivered for a while. We will have time to examine and analyze all options. One of the things in addition to the management agenda that I established in July, is a governance board whose challenge is to integrate the whole digital universe directly, more directly into the established policies of acquisition, preservation, and access.

And so, they are going to have to examine these questions thoroughly. I set it up in January and they have been meeting since February. How to provide access to electronic information like the Twitter collection is one of the big challenges that will have to be covered.

I am not sure I heard exactly a specific question.

Senator NELSON. Well, I realize it is probably not a fiscal year 2011 matter, but I suspect that it could be coming at us in the fis-

cal year 2012 budget or some future budget and am not suggesting that this not be accomplished. What I am suggesting is that we have a cost-benefit analysis that needs to be made on this. It is one thing to receive it. It is another thing to create the opportunity for access.

Dr. BILLINGTON. Yes. It is currently estimated that a small team over the next 6 months will devote about 144 hours or under \$10,000 to the details of handling the archive. I think that it is probably going to end up costing a little more than that, but we will give you clear progress reports on this.

WEB GOVERNANCE BOARD

But I have set up, as I say, in January a Web governance board to determine and execute a Library-wide strategy, Web strategy for the future. That Board has been meeting, getting the content people and the specialists in Web matters together, hammering out policy options. And that is an ongoing activity. Unlike a lot of the management agenda, which is nearly completed—the eight task forces, which will shortly get their final reports in—this will be an ongoing enterprise, in addition to the team that I have just mentioned, which will not be very expensive.

Incorporating the latest technologies is a challenge, but if we did not take this on, we would risk losing early exposure to what is clearly going to be an increasing communications phenomenon of our culture.

Senator NELSON. Well, there is no question that it is and it ought to be preserved. I will have to try to figure out the probative value or societal utility of having access from the general public to the Tweets. Retaining it and preserving it is one thing. Creating what might be access could be not only costly but, I don't know, of questionable value to the average person. Curiosity is at a certain level, there is no doubt, but I don't know what the societal value would be of that for access. So I hope you would look at that aspect of it.

Dr. BILLINGTON. No, our use for it—it was also conveyed to Google. We won't have the main responsibility to be the processor of every request. But how it is to be handled and if we have it for different purposes than they do are questions at this point. Google may be able to do some things that we can't do. They probably will.

Our job is to do exactly what you say. It is easier to compute the cost than it is to define the benefits. But the overall benefit is one of keeping this unique repository of the world's knowledge and of America's creative expression, that deals with the phenomenon of change in our society.

Senator NELSON. I understand, but it is not quite like a book you can check out.

Dr. BILLINGTON. No.
Thank you, sir.

ADDITIONAL SPECIALISTS FOR CRS

Senator NELSON. On CRS, you are requesting 17 new FTEs for the Congressional Research Service to broaden the research expertise. How did you arrive at the number, and if funded, will you be requesting more FTEs for CRS in fiscal year 2012? In other words,

is this something that is an ongoing requirement? Or is it a backlog of Member requests, or perhaps you could give some explanation as to why there would be a request of this size?

Dr. BILLINGTON. I will just say one word and then give it to Director Mulhollan of the Congressional Research Service. But basically, it is a phenomenon of the reduction in staff at a time when the complexity and volume of requests has increased. So it is their analytic response to your requests. By "you," I mean the Congress. There is a strong interest in scientific and technical matters that have become far more complex, with far more requests coming in far more frequently.

So it is 2 years, as I understand it. It is a 2-year phenomenon to regain some of the very considerable amount of lost staffing that has occurred over recent years. But the Director can answer it more fully.

Senator NELSON. Sure.

Mr. MULHOLLAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the question. How we arrived at it is we took a top-down view throughout the service with regard to what the demands are now and what we anticipate the demands will be in the future, as well as our current capacity. And what that capacity is in a number of areas.

What we are asking for is a total of 34 positions, 17 for fiscal years 2011 and 2012, which would get us back to slightly more than the 705 FTE level we had in fiscal year 2007. Why do we need to get back to that earlier level? One example is that 13 of those positions are in science and technology. I am sure you both have heard about the need for increasing capacities and the demands on the Congress in these areas.

Just recently, the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee of the Senate reported out S. 1649, which authorized \$2 million for 3 years to increase CRS's science and technology capacity, as an example. This is something that the Congress is going to be facing. And what you have in CRS, I would argue, is a cost-effective tool and a shared expertise.

You have a physicist that can work for Commerce, Science, and Transportation in the morning, for Armed Services in the afternoon, and Environment and Public Works in the evening. It is shared expertise. It is cost effective.

Second, we are asking for eight researchers with expertise in financial regulation and the financial services industry, and eight on the health side. Our experience is that my colleagues in both those areas did not have a 2-day weekend for over a year. And I foresee that demand in the future.

Because of the demands in the future, we feel that these are reasonable requests. I haven't asked for additional FTEs for CRS since fiscal year 2003, and so I hope you view us as being prudent with the taxpayers' hard-earned money. But we are looking at what Congress needs and the incredible challenges being faced. The shared expertise you have here is a good investment.

Senator NELSON. I understand.

Senator Murkowski. Thank you.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

OPEN WORLD LEADERSHIP CENTER

I will go to Ambassador O'Keefe. I don't want you to feel left out here this afternoon.

Back when we had the fiscal year 2010 legislative branch conference report, we included some language in that that encouraged the Open World Leadership Center to expand its effort to raise private funding in order to reduce requirements for appropriations, and then in this hearing last year, I had asked a question about outside funding sources. This was as it related to the United States-Russia Foundation and whether or not there could be a possibility of some funding to the Center.

Can you speak, Ambassador, to the issue of any efforts to raise private funding to help offset some of the funding requirements and kind of where we are in some of these efforts?

Ambassador O'KEEFE. Yes, ma'am. I can speak to that.

FUNDRAISING EFFORTS

Last year, we raised \$413,000 in outside funding. For this year, we are projecting \$619,000. So we have got a bit of a boost.

With regard to foundations, we are seeking grants not only from the United States-Russia Foundation, but from other foundations. We have not yet been successful in getting those grants.

In terms of more structural approach, as I mentioned, we reduced staff by one. I have hired an expert on a 6 month contract to help us find our way with a really good, solid funding strategy, to help us develop the kinds of basic materials that will have the funds manager at a foundation actually look at what we have.

So I can't say that we are rolling in dough or that we will be rolling in outside funding next year, but I can tell you that we have this effort moving forward. I don't want to take up too much time. But I would also mention that we will seek funds from individual donors as well.

EXPANSION OF THE OPEN WORLD PROGRAM

Senator MURKOWSKI. Then let me ask about the Center's plans for expanding the exchange program into other countries. I think you mentioned Belarus and Armenia. I think you mentioned three, did you not?

Ambassador O'KEEFE. Uzbekistan was the third, Senator. Yes.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Uzbekistan, okay. What does it cost to start up a program in other areas? As far as expansion costs, what does this mean to the Center, and give me a little background there.

Ambassador O'KEEFE. Start-up costs are, depending on how we approach it, about a minimum of \$50,000 or so to get the logistics contractor to function in the country. What we look for is whether they have existing offices. But then we have to pay for whatever additional staff they need.

We have taken a slightly different approach in the latest expansion in Turkmenistan. We skipped the logistics contractor and just had the Embassy do the logistics for us. It was 30 percent cheaper. We could do it there because the Embassy staff wasn't as pressed as in some of the other countries where we have a more robust relationship.

I would say that entry cost is not prohibitive. We can manage it. The reason for the three countries is that it is not simply part of the strategic plan, but these three distinct areas—central Asia, Caucasus, and that slowly changing European border, which seems to move back and forth—are areas important to United States interests.

And in particular, I would stress that in Uzbekistan and Belarus, there has been limited exchange because of strained relationships. Because we are a legislative branch agency and because we are associated with the Library, we have a much easier time of operating and attracting people in the program in those countries.

Senator MURKOWSKI. If you were held to the fiscal year 2010 funding level of \$12 million, how would it impact the operations, the staff level? Would you be able to move forward with these proposed expansions? Just give me some assessment as to what it might look like.

Ambassador O'KEEFE. Yes, ma'am.

FREEZE LEVEL SCENARIO

I would say that if we are at the same amount, we are going to have to cover increased costs in our information technology (IT) contract and in our logistics contract. So to cover those costs, we would probably reduce numbers. Expansion would be held off for the time being.

One of the things we might seek, as I mentioned, is cost shares. If we could find an organization to do a 50–50 cost share in any of these three places, we would consider it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

COPYRIGHT APPLICATIONS BACKLOG

And then, Dr. Billington, I just have one last question for you, and this is as it relates to the Copyright Office. Can you give me any detail on the extent of the backlog right now within copyright and how you are addressing the backlog issue?

Dr. BILLINGTON. Well, very briefly, the current backlog is 326,000 claims. We expect to return to a normal processing level, 150,000 claims, by this time next year, roughly speaking. We realize that we were not responding as quickly as we had hoped and so the Library detailed at the beginning of this year 50 Library employees outside of copyright to make a kind of storming effort to reduce this, which they did very successfully.

We are getting there, and the prospect of deliverance comes both from the fact that they have hired a lot of new people, and they had this big jolt from additional staff effort. But also, the electronic registration system now covers 75 percent of the claims now, up from 54 a year ago. And so, automation is rapidly helping address the problem, as we hoped.

And with the few FTEs that are required to complete the electronic registration process, this should be a one-time concern that we can overcome by this time next year.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Good. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING AND PROGRESS

Senator NELSON. Dr. Billington, in fiscal year 2010, the Library received \$15 million for technology infrastructure upgrades. Can you give us an update on how these funds have been used and what the Library has been able to accomplish with fairly large investment?

Dr. BILLINGTON. Well, the general picture is that about \$9 million of that is going to deal with the hard technology and the supporting software, networking software, which will fortify the three major data centers of the Library, which are the Capitol Hill complex, Culpeper, and Manassas, where the backups are. \$3.5 million will deal with content, the content problem, and \$2.5 million with content presentation.

We are in the process of getting this much more precisely defined. But by and large, this is—that is the rough definition of the work. But we are in the process, as I say, of getting this much more exactly defined, and we will get you a more detailed account shortly.

INVENTORY MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

Senator NELSON. Sure. And in the new request for fiscal year 2011, you have included \$1 million for inventory management. How will this money be expended, and what will that accomplish?

Dr. BILLINGTON. I am sorry, I couldn't—

Senator NELSON. The \$1 million for inventory management?

Dr. BILLINGTON. Yes. Well, this is an ongoing process. We have already done a fair amount of inventory management, but it is a very demanding process. I can provide you with exactly what this request covers for the record.

Senator NELSON. Sure. That would be fine. Does it include FTEs? Do you hire an outside firm to do it? I guess if you can give us that for the record, that would be helpful.

Dr. BILLINGTON. No, I think we are doing it internally.

Ms. JENKINS. I was just going to say that it is contract support. It is \$1 million for us to do an inventory across the general collections in library services, but it is no new FTEs, just \$1 million—

Senator NELSON. So it is contract?

Ms. JENKINS. Yes.

Senator NELSON. That is what I wondered, yes. So no ongoing, it is a one-time sort of expenditure?

Ms. JENKINS. It is ongoing funding of contract personnel.

Senator NELSON. I see. Sure.

Dr. Billington, in the Law Library account, there are two items that are being requested, class K conversion and Gazette preservation backlog. Is this an area where there is a potential for user fees to help us with the budget?

Dr. BILLINGTON. I am sorry. I didn't quite hear that again.

USER FEES AND LAW LIBRARY SERVICES

Senator NELSON. There are two items in the Law Library in the fiscal year 2011 budget request. One was called class K conversion and Gazette preservation backlog. In connection with your answer—

ing those questions, I have the other question of whether this is an area where we might access some user fees, the Law Library?

Dr. BILLINGTON. Well, that is a complicated question. You have the whole question of the user fees. The Library of Congress, by and large, does not do that. Many other libraries do, but we don't do that. When I sign for an acquisition, for anything for the Library, I don't sign for the Library of Congress. I sign for the United States of America. And I am basically committing our resources to preserving it and making it accessible.

Now if you get into the user fee business, you end up drifting your talent inevitably toward somebody's user fee. But the users are the entire people of the United States. Of course, in the first instance, the Congress itself. And so, that is an area we are reluctant to get into. But what you have with this request is something of rather great importance to the Congress and the Government and to the judiciary, for that matter, and the executive branch, which is to have the up-to-date Gazettes, which are the basic laws of other countries.

Law collections have already been catalogued before completion of the K classification, but they are not accessible because the people who know both the old system and the new are retiring. We must complete the K class conversion. The legal community has been agitating about this, and you may want to consider the arguments they have made.

The new head of our Law Library has great experience both in the private sector and in the public sector. Do you want to have a word here?

Ms. SHAFFER. Yes, thank you, Senator. Good afternoon.

The issue here really is making this collection easily and immediately attainable when you, the Members of Congress, need the material. And in its current format, it is either fragile because of its physical properties or it is inaccessible because it isn't organized in a way that makes it quickly available.

And so, the purpose of both of these projects is to accomplish a stability for the Gazettes so that we will have access to them whenever you need them, and particularly for many jurisdictions where the Gazette is the only resource, where there are no commercial resources that duplicate what is there.

And in the case of the K class, it is kind of like thinking of going to a grocery store and not having the different categories of food organized by category. So it makes it very inefficient and could lead to an inability to find things on a timely basis for Congress, our key client and customer.

Thank you.

Senator NELSON. Thank you.

Dr. BILLINGTON. I have to say, the legal community has been very concerned about the K class conversion, and this is an area where, while one doesn't want to get into the business of charging fees, if there were some donations on the part of a committee of this kind, we have ample opportunity to receive donations and use them directly for this purpose.

Senator NELSON. You aren't going to be waiting very long for generous lawyers, are you?

I understand.

Well, thank you very much, all of you. I want to thank our witnesses for joining us today. It has been a very informative hearing.

LIBRARY BUDGET OFFICER EMPLOYEE OF THE WEEK

And before we recess, I would like to acknowledge one more person from the Library of Congress staff, the Library's Budget Officer, Ms. Mary Klutts, and to congratulate her for being honored as one of Senator Kaufman's Federal employees of the week. We thank you for your many years of hard work.

And we know that you will provide many more, and we also appreciate the fact that Senator Kaufman recognized you for it.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Any additional questions from members will be submitted to you for response in the record.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the Library for response subsequent to the hearing:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR BEN NELSON

FLAT BUDGET

Question. I am committed to a flat budget in fiscal year 2011. What could the Library do to assist me in obtaining that goal? Have you considered options within the Library for recovering any of your costs?

Answer. The Library has actively pursued opportunities to offset costs through reimbursable services over more than 20 years, significantly building its range of fee-supported programs and services over those years by both statute and policy.

The Library administers its fee-based activities under the authority of 2 U.S.C.182b-c and 2 U.S.C. 150, which enable the Library to recover the costs associated with specific services provided to customers and the general public:

- The operation of a gift shop and other sales of items associated with collections, exhibits, performances, and special events of the Library of Congress for public visitors and other individuals or organizations;
- Document reproduction and microfilming services for researchers, libraries, government agencies, and other entities in the United States and throughout the world;
- The sale of Library of Congress cataloging data and related publications to libraries and information service organizations and individuals in the United States and throughout the world;
- The procurement of commercial information services, publications, and library support services, as well as related education and information services, for Federal libraries and information centers (FEDLINK program);
- Customized research reports, translations, and analytical studies for a fee for entities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia on a cost-recovery basis. The products derived from these services make the Library's vast collections available to analysts and policy makers throughout the Federal and District of Columbia governments, maximizing the utility of the collections through the language and area expertise of the Federal Research Division staff.
- Preservation, duplication and delivery services for the Library's audiovisual collections, including motion pictures, videotapes, sound recordings, and radio and television broadcasts.

However, charging fees for public services that traditionally have been "free" presents challenges. In 2007 the British Library proposed new fees for basic services such as reading room use. The proposal met with widespread public dissent which included public protests. The British Library ultimately did not implement the proposed fees. The British Library does charge for services that add value to their core work for the public good, as does the Library of Congress. The services for which the British Library charges are defined by law, the British Library Act 1972, as is the case with the Library of Congress, and include content reproduction, retail gift shop operations, and document delivery. As with the Library, these services largely cover costs and do not have sufficient market scale to generate substantial profit.

In fiscal 2009, Library Services reorganized the Office of Business Enterprises. This program consolidates the business operations of three cost-recovery services to

create economies of scale and cost efficiencies. Examples of efforts that will provide additional service to Congress and the public while also reducing and recovering costs include: network printing in the Library's reading rooms, print-on-demand for Library publications, digital reproduction of collections, and cooperative agreements with external entities.

Question. Is cost-sharing a possibility in any of the services you provide? Could you consider additional charges for copyright services to offset the costs associated with storage of the items; perhaps to charge more for larger items requiring more storage?

Answer. The Library provides a number of services on a cost-sharing basis, as indicated in the answer above. The Copyright Office, in addition, engages in cost-sharing with respect to most of its services to the public. Section 708 of the Copyright Act directs the Office to set its fees for services at "not more than that necessary to cover the reasonable costs incurred by the Copyright Office for the services." The fees "shall be fair and equitable and give due consideration to the objectives of the copyright system." Copyright fees are periodically evaluated and adjusted following an activity-based costing methodology. Because the Copyright registration system is voluntary and because it is in the public interest to encourage registration so that authors and copyright owners can be identified, fees are set at levels that are intended to encourage registration while recovering as much of the cost of the service as is possible. The current registration fee covers most but not all of the cost of performing that service, including the cost of physical storage of deposits. The annual appropriation of the Copyright Office supports service-related activities not recovered by fees and other costs not related to fee services. Fees for services that are performed only for the benefit of the person paying the fee are set at or near full cost recovery. In August 2009, the Copyright Office adjusted fees to reflect its new reengineered processes. Typically, fees are adjusted every 3 years.

COLLECTIONS MANAGEMENT

Question. Two years ago, GAO looked at the Library's management of its collections. One of GAO's recommendations was that the Library develop a Library-wide strategy for making its collection available in electronic form—both as a means of providing greater access to its collections as well as to substitute for physical storage. In response, the Library developed a preliminary digitization strategy. What is the current status of the Library's digitization strategy?

Answer. The Library's digital strategy guides all efforts to add digital content to the collections Library-wide. The Library now has enormous digital content holdings, however digital information is not viewed as a replacement for the physical record of knowledge and creativity represented in the paper-based collections. Our digital strategy recognizes a need to maintain hard copies of many materials in view of the impermanence of digital material. While we expect an increasing percentage of the materials we collect will come to us in electronic form in future years, the current reality is that the production of physical materials has not slowed, and there is little overlap between our physical and digital collections. Expanding our digital content holdings will not result in a reduced requirement for physical storage space.

Question. The strategy indicated that the Library would design a study to examine the feasibility of substituting digitized content for physical storage. Has such a study been conducted? If so, what were the results?

Answer. The Library's study of this issue has shown that digital preservation technology serves immediate access needs, however digitized content is vulnerable to silent and virtually undetectable loss over time. While a digital collection can be stored in a relatively small space, hacking, user error, technological failure, and future migration to new formats and platforms could have the same devastating effect of a fire on such a collection. Libraries and the Library have largely eliminated the catastrophic effects of fires; they have not been able to eliminate the technological risks posed to digital collections. Almost universally, preservation experts have questioned digitized content as a safe medium for passing the nation's intellectual legacy onto the next generations. The Library is working actively to address the technical challenges of digital preservation.

Question. Two possible options to reduce physical storage requirements are (a) changing the requirements for copyright deposit to allow for electronic formats as "best available," and (b) maintaining the second required deposit copy in electronic form. To what extent have you looked into these two options?

Answer. The Library is actively pursuing deposit of electronic works. We are looking at recommending changes in the Copyright law so that the "best edition" requirement can be modified or replaced to permit the submission of electronic copies

even when the only copies that are “published” are in non-electronic formats, or to permit the submission of one electronic copy and one non-electronic copy in such cases. Such a change would be subject to consultation and input from copyright owners (i.e. publishers). The Library is also working on an e-Deposit system to address several important needs. Chiefly, an electronic submission service is essential to provide the technological infrastructure needed to support electronic submissions. While we are currently in the developmental stages of this effort, we expect to have an operational system for the receipt of electronic serials within a year. We will doubtless learn much from this experience, and we intend to incorporate the lessons learned in the development of a similar system for the deposit of monographic materials.

Question. According to the preliminary strategy, an increasing volume of deposits are “born digital.” How has this been factored into future demand for physical storage?

Answer. At present, the rise of digital publishing has not been accompanied by a decrease in print publishing; hence there has been no reduction in the need for physical storage. If the output of print publications diminishes substantially in coming years, the Library’s need for additional space will correspondingly be reduced.

Question. The Library’s strategy also lays out ambitious goals for building and securing an IT infrastructure, which this subcommittee funded last year. How will the Library use this technology to achieve greater efficiencies through reduced need for physical storage?

Answer. Enhancements to the core IT infrastructure will not directly lead to greater efficiencies through reduced need for physical storage. Information technology tools and services are utilized in ever more effective ways to provide discovery of and access to the Library’s digital content. This infrastructure can lead to greater efficiencies for internal operations and enhanced access for remote users, but it has little impact on the need for physical storage.

STORAGE

Question. I feel that we cannot continue to take in the current volume of items without recovering some of the costs for their storage and I feel strongly that this is something we need to look very carefully at. I know one of your top priorities for fiscal year 2011 is funding the construction of book storage module 5. This is going to be difficult to accomplish in a flat budget year as I have committed to this year. Are there any items you’d be willing to cut from your budget to fund this project?

Answer. In the event of a flat budget, the Library already will have to absorb \$18 million in mandatory pay and price level increases—costs that we are statutorily required to pay. The Library could absorb the cost of mandatory pay and price level increases through a significant reduction of base programs, specific options that we are investigating. If the Library were to further identify a funding source within its base for Fort Meade Module 5, this would very likely have an impact on staffing.

Question. Are storage modules 1–4 currently at full capacity? When do you expect to have them completely utilized?

Answer. Module 1 has been completely filled since late 2005. Module 2 will be completely filled within the next 2 months. Extensive planning has been done over a period of years to ensure that every inch of space in Modules 3 and 4 is fully and effectively utilized to store non-book, special format collections. A detailed blueprint of every shelf and what will be placed on each shelf was developed and will serve as the guide to the placement of each of 237,000 trackable containers of special collections items. The Library has embarked on a 3 year transfer program to complete the filling of Modules 3 and 4. By the close of fiscal 2010, 25 percent of the trackable containers will have been moved to Fort Meade, with the remainder to follow over a period of 18–24 months.

Question. What efforts are being made to streamline your acquisition process so that we are getting the best “bang for our buck” in terms of the utilization of limited storage space?

Answer. The Library has taken steps to address and reaffirm its collecting policies and to assure that they continue to be in the best interests of the Library, Congress, and the American research and general user communities, carefully revising its Collections Policy Statements to assure that it was continuing to collect and retain only appropriate materials for the collections. The revised statements take into account the emergence of digital content and the acceptance of digital content over print or other formats where appropriate. In addition the Associate Librarian for Library Services has begun to work with staff to consider the number of copies of individual works to retain for the collections in the digital age.

The Library also has issued a new regulation governing the mandatory deposit of copyrighted electronic serials available online that will allow the Library to determine if it can accept digital serial content instead of print. The outcome of this phase of mandatory deposit for digital content will set the stage for expanding to other formats of digital content.

The Library has undertaken an ambitious plan to restructure the massive exchange program (International Exchange Service—IES) that provides access to documents produced by more than 120 other national government agencies and international bodies. IES is being revamped to allow the Library to have online access to this content of foreign governments that is so invaluable to Congress and the legislative process. As part of review of IES, new agreements have been forged that have already reduced the number of print titles shipped to the Library in favor of remote virtual access.

Library Services has been working to develop a plan to establish a central unit devoted to collections development. This unit will have responsibility for advising the Librarian and the Associate Librarian on acquisitions policies, helping to ensure that defensible acquisitions are being made. In June the Librarian will convene the annual meeting of key acquisitions and recommending managers and staff to discuss items acquired over the past year. At this meeting as in past years, he and the Associate Librarian will reaffirm that staff are adhering to sound acquisitions policies.

CRS

Question. You are requesting 17 new FTE for the Congressional Research Service to broaden research expertise. How did you reach this number? If funded, will you be requesting more FTE for CRS in fiscal year 2012? What prompted you to request a large increase in staffing for CRS? Is there a backlog of member requests?

Answer. CRS research managers identified gaps in specialized skills that cannot be resolved by reassigning positions or retraining staff. Full analytical support for the complex emerging issues facing Congress will require 34 new positions. Half of this increase is requested in fiscal year 2011 with the remainder expected to be included in the fiscal year 2012 budget request. This request is prompted by the need to broaden expertise and strengthen analytical capacity in the critical areas of science and technology, healthcare, financial economics and accounting, and social policy related to employment, immigration, and the workforce. There is no backlog of member requests. However, CRS not only responds to congressional inquires but must anticipate congressional needs to provide the research and analysis when Congress requires it. This request would help alleviate workload issues but the primary benefit is producing more comprehensive and sophisticated analyses of increasingly complicated issues.

Question. You are also requesting \$2.1 million for “information technology research architecture” for CRS. This Committee provided \$15 million for information technology upgrades library-wide in fiscal year 2010. Can you explain this new request?

Answer. The increased funding in fiscal year 2010 for library-wide information technology upgrades did not include the information technology research architecture that is unique to CRS. Improvements are needed in research data management due to the increasing number of large complex datasets needed to produce authoritative multi-disciplinary analysis. The \$2.1 million investment will provide the expertise and systems (hardware and software) to efficiently access reliable data and information from a CRS-wide data library that is constructed to allow full utilization of its contents. It will provide modern content delivery technologies including interactive maps, data set mining, personalization features such as content tagging, and enhanced access to CRS products from mobile devices.

Question. Dr. Billington, when prioritizing your request, how would you rank your request for new CRS personnel?

Answer. The request for new CRS personnel ranks third in the Library’s priorities for fiscal 2011, after funding for mandatory pay and price level increases and funding for Fort Meade, Module 5.

LAW LIBRARY

Question. Please explain the two items you are requesting for the Law Library. (Class K Conversion and Gazette Preservation backlog).

Answer. The Library has requested \$353,000 and 3 FTEs over 10 years to complete the classification of the legal collections for the following reasons:

- The Class K standard expanded the shelving arrangement according to jurisdiction, subject, form, author, and year to create a unique classification number for each title.
 - Since it is difficult to find contractors with the necessary experience in legal cataloging, legal publishing, and the law, the Law Library must rely on its established staff base.
 - Limited staffing to support the conversion of titles acquired before the implementation of the Class K system has resulted in 610,000 volumes remaining unclassified.
 - Until classified, legal materials remain mostly invisible and inaccessible, yet these materials have critical research importance in a global environment.
 - In order to cope with the Library managing two distinct collections (K-classed and unclassified), two different systems for shelving materials have been used. Staff members knowledgeable about the two systems are retiring. As a result, materials are more difficult to find.
- The Library has requested \$760,000 over 3 years for microfilming official gazettes, to eliminate the Gazette preservation backlog:
- Most nations publish their newly effective laws, regulations, and treaties in newspaper form known as official gazettes—a source of legal documentation essential to a comprehensive, authoritative law collection.
 - Due to the volatility of newsprint, the Law Library uses microfilm as a means of preservation. In the past, the Law Library had partners sharing the cost of preserving the gazettes. However, the loss of these partners has resulted in a 5.3 million-page backlog.
 - The inability to keep up with this preservation workload will result in future permanent gaps in the Law collection, and will adversely impact the usability and veracity of the Law Library collection for research.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Question. What is included in the \$1.6 million Staff Development Program you are requesting?

Answer. This request supports substantially expanded loan repayment and tuition reimbursement options for the Library to attract and retain the top talent needed to operate in today's dynamic operating environment. Such flexibilities are accepted practice in other government agencies.

A formal training needs assessment conducted across the Library revealed common agency training priorities that could be more efficiently addressed by consolidating expenses through delivery of centralized training. Currently the Library operates an award-winning staff development program that trains 60 staff members per year. With the requested funding, the Library plans to expand the developmental opportunities available to the entire Library staff population. There is a particular need for training to help the Library's multi-cultural, multi-generational staff improve customer service and collaborative skills to keep up with technological advances and the changing work environment. This request also enables the Library to offer staff career planning services, another critical and long-standing need articulated by the Library's labor organizations.

Question. What is the Supervisor Development Program you are requesting \$1.048 million for?

Answer. The Library has requested \$1.048 million and 3 FTEs as part of a centralized training and development program. The Library's current Supervisor Development Program requires centralized funding to provide essential training to supervisors Library-wide. Individual Service and Support Units have not been able to consistently fund all the elements of required foundational training that apply to all supervisors. The Library recently established quarterly Supervisor Forums for all managers and supervisors to share information, initiatives, clarify questions, and share best practices for effectively supervising and managing staff at the Library. These forums, along with other supervisor focus groups, feedback from existing supervisory courses, and the Library-wide Employee Survey results have all indicated a clear need for additional supervisory training to motivate and support high levels of staff performance and a high performance culture across the agency. The requested funding will be used for Workforce Performance Management advisory and support services, to ensure that supervisors know how to set appropriate performance expectations for employees, provide performance feedback, and effectively evaluate performance. We are also requesting funding for Senior Leadership Development, to develop and implement a pilot program to prepare current middle management for positions at the senior managerial level. Currently 50 percent of the Library's senior-level staff is eligible for retirement.

Question. Is the Library's Office of Opportunity, Inclusiveness, and Compliance adequately staffed? How is diversity at the Library?

Answer. In 2008 the Library began a process of reorganizing its Office of Workforce Diversity to develop a more responsive and efficient operation. The Office of Opportunity, Inclusiveness, and Compliance (OIC) is now structured and funded in a manner consistent with Federal best practices, based on the results of an Inspector General review.

A talented and diverse workforce is at the heart of the Library's vision for the future and a key component of the Librarian's management agenda and strategic plan. The current workforce includes slightly more than 3,600 employees. These employees represent every race and gender and speak a collective total of more than 50 different languages. As of December 31, 2009, the Library's workforce consisted of 56 percent women and 44 percent minorities. This diversity is consistent with strong and ongoing efforts to train and nurture the workforce, including annually rating Library managers on their demonstrated commitment to leverage diversity in their organizations. The OIC is working on a comprehensive diversity report to be issued by the end of fiscal 2010. The Library is working to ensure OIC's efforts and human resource strategies are complementary in development of the 5-year human capital plan. This human capital plan, when finalized, will contain clearly defined strategies for continuing to improve diversity at the Library and specific performance indicators to measure results and further enhance accountability.

TWITTER

Question. I understand that Twitter recently agreed to donate its digital archive of public tweets to the Library of Congress. What is the relevance of this collection?

Answer. As the keeper of the mint record of American creativity, the Library has over time collected works in whatever form that activity is expressed, most recently digital. The Twitter archive is a new form of communication with world-wide participation. Scholars today and in the future will mine the data set, researching a vast number of subjects and trends. A number of researchers have already expressed interest in gaining access to the material. The Twitter collection provides an important opportunity to learn more about preserving large research data sets.

Question. Will this donation result in additional maintenance costs to the Library?

Answer. We estimate that a small team will be able to work out the details of handling the Twitter archive over the next 6 months. The cost of tape storage and equipment to operate the tapes, based on 5 terabytes of data per year, is estimated to be \$3,000 the first year and an additional \$1,000 for succeeding years and can be handled within our existing technical infrastructure. Because accepting and preserving collections are part of regular staff responsibilities, we do not anticipate additional staff costs. Once the Library completes an assessment of privacy and access issues related to this archive, it is likely that additional costs will be identified to make the collection accessible.

COPYRIGHT

Question. Your fiscal year 2011 request includes an additional 5 FTE for the Copyright Office. What are these additional personnel needed for?

Answer. Three FTE's are to support of eCO, the backbone technology system for Copyright Office operations. The FTE will expand our technical capabilities in database management, software development, and project management. Two FTE's will oversee the Licensing Division's newly reengineered technology operations. Work on reengineering Licensing Operations begins in early Summer 2010, with system implementation scheduled for a year later. With the envisioned web-based licensing submissions and electronic processing, the Licensing Division will need technical support. As the Licensing Division is self-funded, this would not impact the Library of Congress Federal appropriation.

Question. What is your current backlog of copyright applications waiting to be processed?

Answer. As of May 16, 2010 the backlog of claims awaiting processing is approximately 317,000.

Question. How effective is your new paperless registration system? What percent of applications do you currently receive online vs. in the mail?

Answer. eService, the Copyright Office online registration system, is very effective. Currently we receive 75 percent of our weekly submissions through electronic filing. As we improve our online systems, we expect electronic submissions to increase.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Question. Dr. Billington, you received \$15 million in fiscal year 2010 for technology infrastructure upgrades for the Library. Can you update the subcommittee on your use of these funds? What has the Library been able to accomplish with this large investment of resources?

Answer. The long-term vision for this funding is, by 2016, to acquire, preserve, and deliver important cultural, legislative and copyright information online that is reliable and authentic; where anyone can find what is meaningful to them through a set of updated online navigation approaches and tools. In fiscal 2010, funding is being invested in three broad areas to support this vision:

- \$9 million in the core technology: the hardware, operating software, and network devices needed to support the Library's three data centers. This includes: \$7 million in equipment and software to improve the network, storage, backup and restore, and continuity of operations technologies and facilities to provide the infrastructure for content management and content delivery; \$1.4 million for services to support the implementation of the new equipment and software; \$0.6 million for maintenance for the new equipment and software;
- \$3.5 million in new software for content management that restructures the underlying data for better searching (metadata and data ontologies), including legislative information data dictionaries, establishment of data relationships and patterns (including search & navigation patterns), data relationship tools and metadata creation tools, and linking of computing functionality to data sets; digital content ingest, including content integrity preservation, and reusable, modular, flexible and scalable ingest and management tools and services
- \$2.5 million in web architecture development and open source software for the presentation and delivery of content online, on mobile devices, and through easy-to-use interfaces for the user.

The Executive Committee approved the core technology investment plan in December, 2009. To date, requisitions have been submitted for all of the \$9 million in core technology investment. An investment plan and requisitions have been prepared for the \$3.5 million for new software for content management. The enterprise-wide IT Steering Committee (the LOC IT capital investment management board) reviewed this plan on May 25. The investment plan for web architecture development and open source software for presentation and delivery of content online has not been finalized. This \$2.5 million plan will undergo review by both the Web Governance Board and the IT Steering Committee.

INVENTORY MANAGEMENT

Question. You have included \$1 million in your request for Inventory Management. What will this cover? Are all items in the Library's collections currently "inventoried?"

Answer. The funding will cover 23 contractual staff who will continue the inventory of the Library's book and periodical collections. The staff will also inventory the special format materials that will be transferred to Modules 3 and 4. Since the start of the inventory program in fiscal 2002, more than 4 million items have been inventoried. In the general, area studies, and Law Library collections of books and bound periodicals, there are approximately 17 million items, leaving approximately 13 million that need to be inventoried. For the special format collections, e.g., manuscripts, maps, sheet music, and prints and photographs, inventory is also essential to capture information on what we have and where the items are at any given point in time, and to ensure effective access and retrieval.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR LISA MURKOWSKI

FORT MEADE STORAGE MODULE 5

Question. Is the \$16.9 million requested for Storage Module 5 the total cost for design, construction and complete outfitting of the storage unit, so that it would be ready to accept collections for storage? Will additional funding be needed for this storage module in future fiscal years?

Answer. The \$16.9 request for Storage Module 5 will cover construction and outfitting costs. No additional funding will be required by the Library of Congress to make Module 5 fully operational; however, annual funding of \$1 million for ongoing collections inventory management is necessary—a fiscal 2011 funding request—to ensure items transferred to Fort Meade have accurate online records and to continue the inventory of the collections remaining on Capitol Hill. The Architect of the

Capitol will require a funding increase to maintain the facility and for additional utility charges. Module 5 design is complete but will need to be updated to incorporate lessons learned from Modules 1–4, in conjunction with the solicitation of construction contract proposals.

Question. If only partial funding is provided in fiscal year 2011, will it be possible for the Library to begin work on this storage unit and then complete it when the balance of funds are available; or does the Library need the total amount in full before it can begin work on this unit?

Answer. For this construction request, the full amount would be necessary at the time of the construction contract award. (This response has been coordinated with the Architect of the Capitol.)

REQUESTED FTES—HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES

Question. Why is it necessary to have three additional FTE's for the Human Resources Supervisor development program and two additional FTE's for the Human Resources Staff development program? Are these staff development programs new, or are they being expanded in some way that requires additional personnel?

Answer. Of the total staff development request of \$1.6 million, a quarter of it (\$408,000) is for two GS–12 career planning specialists and contractual support, to provide career planning services for the entire Library. This funding would enable Human Resource Services to expand on staff development services they already provide in response to a need articulated by the Library's labor organizations for professional career planning services.

Question. Are there certain elements of the supervisor development program and the staff development program that can be combined so as to achieve efficiencies in the organization, operation, and cost of the programs?

Answer. Of the three FTES requested for supervisory development, one is for the coordination of supervisor development training services; the other two are to staff the workforce performance management program. Both of these functions currently are being provided on a skeletal level because of the absence of dedicated personnel. The Library's current performance management practices, coordinated by a staff of one, were flagged as a critical weakness in the recent Employee Survey. The five requested positions address separate operational needs, all essential, in the Library's human resources program.

Question. What are the goals of the supervisor and staff development programs?

Answer. Goals of staff and supervisor development services are to enable the Library to provide consistently outstanding services to an expanding customer base, within a dynamic work environment involving the use of wide-ranging new technologies, with fewer and fewer staff.

Question. What is the anticipated outcome from this investment?

Answer. Additional funding will enable the Library to address critical training and development gaps, increasing efficiency and effectiveness across the entire organization.

CAPITOL POLICE MERGER

Question. Last year we completed the merger of the Library of Congress security officers with the U.S. Capitol Police. From the Library's perspective, how were the police merger and the transition of personnel, resources, and police mission handled? Was this a smooth transition?

Answer. Overall, the police merger and transition of personnel, resources, and police mission were successfully accomplished.

Question. Since the police merger, have the Capitol Police and the Library of Congress worked through the remaining issues related to the reimbursement of overtime for Library events?

Answer. The two agencies have worked out the key details for the Library's reimbursing the USCP for supporting Library special events. The USCP and LOC Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be amended to reflect the reimbursement agreement. Further discussions are occurring to improve coordination and to streamline procedures.

Question. Are there any remaining police coverage issues that the Library has yet to resolve with the Capitol Police? If so, what are those issues?

Answer. The unresolved issues include:

- Jurisdictional issues between the Library's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and the USCP.
- Formalization of information-sharing between the Library and the USCP.
- Finalization of the Library's special events funding coordination and procedural matters.

Question. Since the police merger, have there been any jurisdiction issues related to the collections or building regulations? How have those been resolved?

Answer. Unresolved are jurisdictional issues related to the investigation of criminal activity occurring at the Library, such as suspected theft and malicious damage to Library collections and property. The Library's OIG has proposed that an MOU be formalized between the OIG and the USCP.

CRS SERVICES EVALUATION

Question. The Legislative Branch conference report for fiscal year 2010 concurred with the House report language regarding a CRS services evaluation, which requested that the Director of CRS "conduct a formal evaluation of how well its current staffing models and procedures meet user needs." Has CRS conducted this evaluation? Where is CRS in that process?

Answer. The consulting firm LMI will assess communications mechanisms, including a "Member Advisory Committee", and make recommendations on the best options to promote optimal communication between CRS and Members of Congress. LMI will use the client feedback data they receive and best practices research in developing its recommendations on communications mechanisms. No decision on new mechanisms will be made until the LMI evaluation is completed.

CRS MEMBER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Question. The House report language that was included in the fiscal year 2010 Conference Report also directed CRS to "consider creation of a new mechanism such as a Member Advisory Committee which would allow routine discussions between CRS leadership and users." Has CRS created a Member Advisory Committee? If so, please explain how the committee is intended to work, or is working.

Answer. The consulting firm LMI will assess communications mechanisms, including a "Member Advisory Committee" and make recommendations on the best options to promote optimal communication between CRS and Members of Congress. LMI will use the client feedback data they receive and best practices research in developing its recommendations on communications mechanisms. No decision on new mechanisms will be made until the LMI evaluation is completed.

DIGITAL TALKING BOOK PROGRAM

Question. Please give us an update on the Digital Talking Book program.

Answer. The Library is on schedule with both digital talking book player and book production. To date approximately 204,000 machines have been produced, with production ongoing at a level of 20,000 players per month. More than 857,000 copies of nearly 2,169 digital titles have been produced and distributed on flash cartridge. A download site now offers nearly 19,000 digital book titles and grows daily. The one-millionth book was downloaded in March 2010.

CONCLUSION OF HEARINGS

Senator NELSON. So thank you, and the subcommittee stands in recess. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 4:40 p.m., Thursday, April 29, the hearings were concluded, and the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]