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The Transformation of the U.S. Government Publishing Office:
A Strategic Analysis from an Intergovernmental Perspective

Abstract

An intergovernmental relations perspective is important to understand challenges facing the U.S. Government Publishing Office (GPO). National library related programs exist as intergovernmental networks tasked with gathering, preserving, and disseminating government information produced at the national level. This paper begins with an overview of the work of the GPO and a discussion of what is meant by an intergovernmental perspective. In reviewing the scholarly literature that has been produced within the last twenty years regarding the work of the GPO, focusing upon organizational dimensions of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), the author addresses intergovernmental trends that are impacting these agencies. These three trends include the need for interagency cooperation, the establishment of stronger capacity, and the necessity to collaborate with non-governmental entities (in this case libraries throughout the country) to fulfill the agency’s mission. This topic must be studied further since there is a need for scholarly literature to address the intergovernmental aspects of the GPO.

Introduction

A scholarly literature review and strategic analysis of the newly named U.S. Government Publishing Office (GPO) from an intergovernmental perspective may inform librarians and concerned stakeholders to better understand the transformation of this important federal agency. National library related programs, such as the work of the GPO, the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), and the Library of Congress, serve as intergovernmental networks engaged in the gathering, preservation, and dissemination of vital information produced at the national level. This article begins with an overview of the work of the GPO and a discussion of what is meant by an intergovernmental perspective. Following this, in reviewing the scholarly literature that has been produced within the last twenty years regarding the work of
the GPO, focusing on the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), the author identifies intergovernmental trends that are impacting the GPO. These three trends include the need for interagency cooperation, the establishment of stronger capacity, and the necessity to collaborate with non-governmental entities (in this case libraries throughout the country) to fulfill the agency’s mission. In conclusion, the author argues that scholars need to study this issue further, and that the U.S. government must work to establish a strategy in order to better carry out the important work of gathering, preserving, and disseminating U.S. government information across agencies and to the people.

This strategic analysis and scholarly literature review is an interdisciplinary approach to view library science from a public administration perspective. An attempt has been made to cite the most relevant scholarly, or peer reviewed articles, relevant to this discussion of organizational topics. This work does not address the cataloging or technical details of USA.gov Web portal or other catalogs or database systems, such as FDsys or the new govinfo.gov site. Replacing GPO Access in January, 2009, FDsys, allowing for free online searching for official publications from all three branches of the federal government, serves as a content management system (CMS), a preservation repository, and an advanced search engine (U.S. Government Printing Office, 2014, par. 1). While the author may identify problems or flaws in the implementation of its mission, the status of the GPO and the FDLP as indispensable elements of the U.S. public administration is not brought into question. As a frame of reference to this discussion, the work of the GPO and the FDLP are public services that are essential to the functioning of a vibrant democracy.
Work of the GPO

What does the GPO do? It should be noted that on December 17, 2014 the Government Printing Office announced that it had changed the name of the agency to Government Publishing Office (GPO, 2014, 14-27). The GPO, established in 1861 with duties defined in title 44 of the U.S. Code, serves as the entity that “produces, procures, and disseminates printed and electronic publications of the Congress, executive departments, and establishments of the Federal Government (Office of the Federal Register, 2013, 50). The Depository Library Act of 1962 (P.L. 85-579) codified the FDLP to serve as a system of federal government information distribution through the traditional paper-based program focusing upon local library maintenance of documents. The Government Printing Office Electronic Information Enhancement Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-40) codified the establishment of the database system GPO Access and the responsibility of the GPO to deliver electronic access to documents. This statute also directed the GPO to make an Internet presence and post online all versions of the Congressional Record and the Federal Register (Kessler, 1996, 375). The transition from a paper to electronic environment has impacted the work of this agency dramatically. At this point in time, as related by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), over 97% of government documents are now “born digital” and use of these documents in electronic form is expected by users (NAPA, 2013,1). Traditionally the major source and delivery system that the librarian used for government information was the GPO, through its database, GPO Access, now the FDsys database system. As a result of this transition therefore, the GPO has fundamentally changed.

The government documents collections in libraries previously have served as the traditional repositories of government information, especially those connected to the FDLP, with
materials delivered through the GPO. Core collections of the FDLP include the *Budget of the U.S. Government*, *Bureau of Census documents*, the *Code of Federal Regulations*, *Public Papers of the President*, the *U.S. Code*, and the *U.S. Government Manual*, to name a few of the hundreds of titles. Of course, the new electronic initiatives aim to increase the accessibility and the provision of government information through libraries, as the physical portals to government information.

The electronic transformation in government information has brought into question the role of the FDLP and its depository library program, along with the role of libraries, and librarians, in the process generally. Government document library collections have traditionally been overseen by “government documents librarians” or “government information librarians.” In the past, the concept that government information, located through library information resources, was of a comprehensive nature was implicit. It is this exclusivity, especially of the academic library, that has made it so appealing to those engaged in research activities. The electronic transformation has demanded the transformation of the government documents collections in libraries and the librarians who have traditionally overseen and provided access to these collections.

**Intergovernmental perspectives**

Since this essay intends to view the GPO from an “intergovernmental” perspective, it is important to note that this is an interdisciplinary approach, viewing library science from a public administration perspective. The question therefore arises: what does “intergovernmental” mean? According to Painter (2012), while the study of intergovernmental relations has traditionally
been confined to “central-local relations within a national system of government,” the study of such formal structures within federalism has changed to include conceptual and theoretical approaches to different overlapping layers of government that include functions “between levels of government and across borders” (732). For Radin (2012), intergovernmental management has switched focus from an examination of vertical relationships between levels of government, to different perspectives, that include horizontal relationships, shifting boundaries in public-private interdependence, and interdependence between levels of government (736). So for the purposes of this discussion, the concept of looking at the “intergovernmental” dimensions of the GPO, focuses mainly upon the activities of this agency with other federal agencies, or with libraries participating in GPO sponsored programs.

The current troubles with intergovernmental aspects of the information infrastructure take place as a perfect storm in the 21st century, in which information is increasing at an exponential rate, while funding for organizations charged with analysis is decreasing. Traditionally, organizations, such as the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), would provide recommendations and advice to decision makers. “Through exposure to high-quality information, policy makers at all governmental levels became better informed about intergovernmental issues” (Cigler, 2012, 281). With the decline of funding for national analytic organizations, along with the ACIR being terminated in 1996, the interagency ability and capacity of the government to analyze and make recommendations continues to decline. The ACIR documents are located at the “Cyber Cemetery” hosted by the University of North Texas Libraries. A notable endeavor on part of the GPO and an academic library, this project is part of the FDLP Content Partnership Program (digital.library.unt.edu/explore/collection/GDCC). Nevertheless, the decline of the federal government’s approach to the analysis of
intergovernmental information impacts the ability of the government to establish a national library information strategy.

**GPO and the Scholarly Literature of Intergovernmental Relations**

There exists a lack of scholarly literature in public administration (or other disciplines such as library science) on the topic of intergovernmental relations between the GPO, NARA, and the Library of Congress, with other government entities, in relation to the Internet or even information technology (IT) more generally. Public libraries, on the other hand, are a topic of discussion from an intergovernmental point of view in the research reports and other publications issued by think tanks, government agencies, and interest groups (Center for an Urban Future, 2014; Pew Charitable Trust, 2013; Swan et. al, 2014). So while public libraries as local institutions appear prominently in such reports, scholarly research on the intergovernmental relationships between the GPO, NARA, or the Library of Congress with other governmental entities regarding federal information programs, is lacking, with the major exception of a recent National Academy for Public Administration (NAPA) report on the GPO, as shall be discussed (2013). It should also be noted here that the GPO, as of this date, is making progress in establishing a “National Plan” that may not be reflected in the scholarly literature (FDLP, 2015), but as of this date, it remains in question.

Library issues generally do not rank as points of great concern as intergovernmental topics for citizens and scholars, as seen, for example, in Weissert, Stenberg, and Cole’s (2009) ranking of key issues. Library issues, such the FDLP or the FDsys database, are just simply not on the public radar or that of the scholarly literature in public administration. Except for
selective literature within Library and Information Science (LIS), the crisis of disorganized, information collection and sharing, or of problematic e-government publishing initiatives by the federal government, seems to be lost within the literature of federalism, and public administration more broadly. Regarding technology more generally and federalism, there has been some research conducted. Rivlin (2012) relates how rising fiscal deficits raise pressure on the need for investments in IT (387). Benton, Byers, and Cigler et al (2007) identified IT as an important agenda item for future county research, including how counties are using IT effectively, and addressed related issues regarding the construction of county-level databases, such as problems in identifying discrete data on counties (976-977). Powell (2000) analyzed Internet taxation and the implications for federalism, including problems of the digital divide, privacy, and international trade and tariff concerns (48-49). Weisssert and Schram (1998) identified state taxation of Internet services, regulation of cellular technology, and licensures of health professionals who practice across state lines as issues, as topics of interest in 1997-98 (11-13). A significant scholarly article on the intergovernmental relations and IT on the federal level, Mullen (2003) examines the need for enhancing federal government inter-agency information capacity and data sharing. In the article, Mullen (2003) concludes that the government must embrace transformation to maximize IT performance across numerous programs, agencies, and tools (462).

As the most recent research report on the need for reform in the GPO, NAPA issued a report, “Rebooting the Government Printing Office: Keeping America informed in the digital age” (January, 2013), that analyzes the GPO and makes recommendations for reforming the agency. As shall be discussed, that report provides important recommendations for the GPO, and these recommendations could also inspire other agencies, such as NARA and the Library of
Congress. As of this writing, there has not been further discussion in the scholarly literature regarding the GPO’s response to this report. (This is not to say that there hasn’t been discussion of this report at various meetings such as the DLC meetings or other internal communications).

Based upon the report, in terms of access to federal information, the U.S. government infrastructure currently exists in a state of chaos. The NAPA report (2013) relates in strong words the need for change in the current state of affairs:

The Panel believes that the federal government needs to establish a broad government-wide strategy to manage digital information through all stages of its lifecycle. The absence of such a strategy has resulted in a chaotic environment with significant implications for public access to government information – and therefore, the democratic process, with some observers describing federal digital publishing as the “wild west.”

(NAPA, 2013, 1).

This statement is an astonishing admonition, not only of the GPO, but of the national government more broadly, in not establishing a plan to better manage government publications. Clearly “chaotic” and “wild west” are not the terms that an agency, or agencies, would like to have associated with their work.

As previously noted, the intergovernmental dimensions of the work of the GPO are largely unaddressed within the predominant venues of LIS. Most of the articles are published in the two main scholarly journals focusing on government information: Government Information Quarterly and the Journal of Government Information (which merged in 2005). While addressing implications for change focusing upon the GPO’s individual programs, as shall be discussed, what is missing is an intergovernmental discussion and analysis of the transformation of an agency like the GPO, due to technological change, and its implications for other agencies and programs. This paper aims to begin this discussion with the intention of stressing the
importance of these issues for an informed citizenry and for more effective intergovernmental planning and cooperation. The following section reviews the scholarly literature that has been produced within the last twenty years regarding the work of the GPO, including the FDLP and future prospects.

FDLP

What is the FDLP? As stated on its Web site, “the mission of the Federal Depository Library Program is to provide free, ready, and permanent public access to Federal Government information, now and for future generations” (FDLP, 2012). The FDLP provides materials through a nation-wide system to member libraries known as Federal Depository Libraries.

Multiple voices over time within the LIS community have questioned the relevance and/or practices of the FDLP as a result of technological change (Cornwell et al., 1993; Aldrich, 1996; Kessler, 1996; Ryan, 1996; Sprehe, 1996; Heisser; 1999; Arrigo, 2004; Selby, 2008). Themes emerge in this literature, such as the problematic characteristics of the GPO as it functions in an increasingly complex technological environment, the difficulty for the GPO to provide an effective strategic vision for the FDLP, and the current and future role of government documents librarians. Many problems concern the electronic transition from print to digital formats. Regarding this transition and the relationship between the GPO and libraries participating in the FDLP, the question exists of whether a clear strategy has been articulated on behalf of the GPO to member libraries regarding the change. Subsequently there has apprehension on the part of librarians, and possibly even a lack of trust, in this area, questioning if the GPO’s plan “to digitize all retrospective documents that can be authenticated back to the
Federalist Papers” can even realistically be accomplished (Berhnolz, 2008, 57). This change in the relationship with the GPO reveals the transition of the librarian as the caretaker of the traditional paper “gateway” to an electronic intermediary for government documents and information.

Concerns over the years have been expressed about the culture of the GPO, which may impact the FDLP, such as its lack of agility, flexibility, vision, and effective communication. For example, Cornwell (1996) complained that “technologies are evolving too quickly for the GPO to be anything less than an equal and active component of change. Librarians have developed countless reports and recommendations that have fallen on deaf or indifferent ears at GPO” (305). Expressing unease at the lack of change, Cornwell, at, al. (1993) issued a “manifesto” to discuss the problems impacting the GPO, such as decreased federal funding, the electronic transition, low capacity, poor communication, and the relationship with depository libraries (128-131). In reaction to critics questioning the lack of vision and the need for change, the GPO was mandated by Congress to issue various reports (Kessler, 1996, 377). The question remains if the calls for change have been heeded.

It is important to note that the Depository Library Council in 2006, and the GPO in 2009, issued documents regarding vision. Considering the critical report by NAPA (2013), it is not clear if the GPO has been proactive in formulating a new vision for the agency. The most recent GPO report on the status of the FDLP was produced at the request of the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP), one of the oldest joint committees in the U.S. Congress, created by the act of August 3, 1846 (9 Stat. 114; 44 U.S.C. 101). The JCP oversees the operations of the GPO. The JCP, in September, 2007, directed the GPO to undertake a study of the FDLP “to evaluate the extent to which public access via the FDLP may be impaired by current and projected
organizational, financial, technological, or other conditions affecting these institutions” (GPO, 2008, 2). In response, the GPO issued the report with three recommendations, including: support of continued appropriations for scanning pre-1976 documents, continue to support efforts to authenticate digital information (with the GPO seal), and to “undertake a more in-depth look at the organizational, financial, and technological issues affecting the FDLP in its entirety…” (GPO, 2008, 8-9). In a major project to gather feedback, the FDLP conducted a study to forecast the needs of member libraries regarding digital and tangible materials (FDLP, 2014). So while the FDLP did address specific initiatives, particularly the effort to authenticate documents with the GPO seal, and to conduct the forecast study, it clearly needs to continue an analysis of the organizational, financial, and technological challenges that it is facing.

The official documents of the GPO itself have not been very specific regarding strategic or visionary initiatives. In its most recent strategic plan available as of this writing, the GPO (2009) identifies its vision of the FDLP with the following statement: “The Federal Depository Library Program will provide information when and where it is needed in order to create an informed citizenry and an improved quality of life” (FDLP, 2009, 6). This is certainly both a noble and inspirational statement. However, it is remarkable that the most recent strategic plan of the FDLP is not yet official and still remains identified as a “draft” document on the agency Web site (2016). While the report contains three goals and multiple strategies to meet those goals, much of the attention is internally-focused towards operations, and not outwardly-focused towards partnership and collaboration. Little attention is given to performance measurement for the various goals, with the exception one goal to “develop new models of communication for the depository library community” accompanied by the following strategy of “conduct outcomes-bases assessments of depository libraries” (FDLP, 2009, 8-9). So while laudable goals were
identified, the strategies, or program objectives, to obtain those goals were not based upon measureable or attainable actions stated with a high level of specificity. "Program objectives should specify milestones to be attained within certain time periods, but in practice, statement of objectives are often overly general, vague, and open-ended in terms of time" (Poister, 2003, 63). As is the case with the GPO’s expressed vision of the FDLP, the vision and strategy remain to be more clearly articulated.

A special characteristic of depository libraries is the presence of government documents librarians to provide guidance and service. A recurrent theme in the literature is that while libraries as the physical depositories are becoming less relevant, government documents librarians/specialists will continue to be important players in the information environment. Aldrich (1996) noted that while the roles of FDLP libraries as depositories and archives will diminish, the need will continue for the expertise of depository librarians (389). Kessler (1996) noted that even in an age of technological change, these librarians continue to remain relevant by providing information services such as reference, instruction, the creation of user aids, and many other individualized services (379). Heisser (1999) examined the commitment of member libraries to the FDLP and how they were coping with the changes in technology (241-259). A major finding of the study was that while there were serious doubts about the future of the program as “universal Internet access” diminished the advantages of depository status, directors firmly believed that there would continue to be an important role for government information specialists in libraries (Heiser, 1999, 241). These “government information specialists” will be educated in how the government works and facilitate access to the “universal” digital depository library of the 21st century (Staley, 2007, 320). Mack and Prescod (2009) recount the need for library staff to stay informed regarding the publication and access of U.S. government
information (99-111). Therefore, a recurrent theme in the literature is that while libraries as the physical depositories are becoming less relevant as a result of technological change, government documents librarians/specialists will continue to be important players in the information environment.

As knowledge workers, the services that government documents librarians provide may have intangible usefulness but constitute the major element of value. Although impossible to quantify, this value is based upon the discernment of professional or expert knowledge. For example, it is the human interaction between the patron and the librarian that forms part of what could be considered the value transaction. For librarians in general, and government documents librarians in particular, the professional image or identity derives from the value-added transaction of the intangible offering of information services. The library, as an institution, reinforces that perception of value. Similarly, for public administrators, professional identity also derives from often intangible offerings of services. For managers in public administration, it is the interaction between the public administrator and the citizen that constitutes a major element of value. Similarly, the government agency, or the library, as an institution, legitimizes the perception of value.

As of this writing in 2016, the influence of not only the Internet, but of technological mediation in general, impacts the perception of public service professions immensely, and has also led to various levels of commodification. Many different technologies that mediate a service transaction, such as bank ATMs, reduce costs and variability in the delivery process, though the creation of a technologically enhanced, self-service experience. Yet the pitfall of this trend is the reduction in personal interaction, which is “the basic social building block of service relationships” (Laing, al., p. 483), and possibly undermines the development of closer customer-
supplier relations, or in this scenario, patron-library relations (or citizen-public administration relations). While many “professional” business services, like stock-broking, have traditionally been personalized, the trend of technological mediation has led to the commodification of certain products along with the reduction in “special status” that has long characterized many professional service exchanges. This phenomenon is occurring in library services (and in public administration), as in other services, delivered by electronic communication systems.

**Future Practices**

The future practices of the GPO have been surmised by various authors attempting to envision its work into the future (Aldrich, 1996; Shuler, 1996; Hernon and Saunders, 2009; Chadwick, et al., 2012). Shuler (1996) envisages the transformation of the government documents librarian and the depository library into the “civic librarian” and “community information organization” (422-423). For Shuler (1996), this new arrangement would allow libraries to serve in new roles with citizens to “create a form of social capital that supports active citizen participation, public program solving, and deliberative dialogue” (424). This concept of the social capital of government documents librarians to increase civic participation through programs provides an interesting possibility. Hernon and Saunders (2009) explore the possible future role of member libraries by interviewing library directors within the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) participating in the FDLP (351-370). Based upon their review, three possible scenarios could take place, including “fold” (in which member libraries no longer feel the need to participate); “status quo” (where libraries continue to collect small amounts of paper documents but rely on Web-based federal information sources primarily); and “proactive” (in
which libraries collaborate with the GPO to service the virtual FDLP (355). In any scenario, the future of the GPO involves change.

The future of the GPO and programs such as the FDLP are dependent upon the e-government framework that continues to be constructed. Currently, the statutory framework upon which the FDLP operates is based upon Legal Requirements & Program Regulations of the Federal Depository Library Program (June, 2011). Based upon the most recent publication of the FDLP Handbook (2008), while the GPO is still functioning based upon an outmoded statutory framework, the agency is making some strides in identifying a vision for the future that includes plans to incorporate enhanced digitization, preservation, and information retrieval for the FDLP (Priebe, Welch, MacGilvray, 2008, 48). An important point expressed by Shuler at al., (2010), in which they identify the need for the “harmonization” between e-government and the FDLP, includes the following recommendations: update laws and policies to address the lag between technological innovation and policy change; address the inclusion of changing technologies into the FDLP approach, including support of social media, mobile computing, and digital reference; establish a collaborative approach between the GPO and member libraries; and support data collection strategies, by providing reliable usage information regarding government information collections, and other factors (14). So while the GPO is dependent upon statutory and regulatory directives, it must work to find its place within the emerging e-government framework.

Recommendations
The need for the GPO to reform is an intergovernmental relations issue, as well as a performance management issue. Rather than abolishing the GPO, as advocated by Sprehe (1996), it should transform itself as a leader in making government information accessible. The argument to abolish the GPO or the FDLP is part of a broader argument to question to the relevance of libraries themselves. Aldrich (1996) submitted that government depository libraries should be known as “federal information access centers” with the term “librarian” replaced with “government information specialists” (390). The removal of the term “library” can have stark consequences. In this situation, the Internet challenges the domain of professionals who have traditionally relied upon informational asymmetries as the basis of the professional/client relationship. From the librarians’ perspective, whether paper or electronic containers of information, documents still exist in libraries. The future of the FDLP is tied to the future of e-government in general. As related in this essay, problems exist regarding the need for interagency cooperation, the establishment of stronger capacity, and the necessity to collaborate with non-governmental entities (in this case libraries throughout the country) to fulfill its mission. This does not mean that the libraries or programs should be abolished.

Concerning interagency cooperation, the first recommendation of NAPA (2013) addresses this important issue. “Congress should establish a collaborative interagency process, and designate a lead agency or interagency organization, to develop and implement a government-wide strategy for managing the lifecycle of digital government information” (3). Inter-organizational cooperation and collaboration can address a number of purposes including policy development; program implementation; oversight and monitoring; information sharing and communication; and building organizational capacity, such as staffing and training (GAO, 2012, 1). Since the GPO faces challenges relating to information overload, it should learn from
the experiences of performance measurement to avoid the dreaded DRIP syndrome (data rich but information poor) that impacts many public agencies. Over time, this problem has caused many public agencies to conclude that the time and effort invested into the performance measurement process were not justified by the results (Poister, 2003, 6).

To establish effective interagency cooperation, an obvious place to coordinate activities between the GPO and other government agencies is the Office of Electronic Government within the Office of Management and Budget, established by the E-Government Act of 2002. Further analysis of digital government strategy is needed to explore this possibility.

Clearly the GPO needs to enhance organizational capacity in the digital environment. Activities involved in the generating of government-wide information capacity include performance measurement and data sharing (Mullen, 2003, 460). The construction of organizational capacity may include activities such as staffing, training, and information technology (GAO, 2012, 7). In this case, the GPO may work to be inspired by aspects of classic public administration approach of New Public Management (NPM). NPM doctrine aims to ensure accountability, efficiency, and effective performance, through a decentralization of managerial control, in which managers are given power and flexibility (Moynihan, 2006, 79). As an essential part of NPM, the collection of performance information is an important activity since it enhances accountability and serves now as part of the fabric of administrative life for public administration (Lynch and Day, 1996, 416). One problem of organizational capacity is how to manage the knowledge that is gathered.

These problems of organizational capacity concern knowledge management in public organizations. “The sending, receiving, and integration of knowledge is fundamental to the
effort to build capacity for performance and accountability” (Weber and Khademian, 2008, 343). So while various agencies pursue performance measurement as mandated by law, regulation, or agency directive, the integration of that knowledge may not take place at an organization that does not allow for enhanced managerial discretion and informed decision making.

The collaboration with non-governmental entities, in this case the institutional members of the FDLP, remains a critical piece of the intergovernmental solution for the GPO. Depository libraries also have a special status not only as archives of government documents, but have the opportunity to be service providers in delivering training and instruction to government information specialists (Arrigo, 2004, 684). Regarding the establishment of “a collaborative interagency process,” or “interagency organization,” NAPA (2013) recommends that the GPO “should work with LC, NARA, OMBA, and other agencies to gather input from libraries and the private sector to develop standards and guidelines for publication, metadata creation, digitization, preservation, and authentication” (27). This advice would allow for the GPO to more effectively plan and strategize for a government-wide digital information plan.

**Conclusion**

An intergovernmental relations perspective is important to understand challenges facing the GPO, and other information related agencies like NARA and the Library of Congress. National library related programs exist as intergovernmental networks tasked with gathering, preserving, and disseminating government information produced at the national level. This paper began with an overview of the work of the GPO and a discussion of what is meant by an intergovernmental perspective. In reviewing the scholarly literature that has been produced
within the last twenty years regarding the work of the GPO, focusing upon organizational dimensions of the FDLP, the author addressed intergovernmental trends that are impacting the GPO. These three trends include the need for interagency cooperation, the establishment of stronger capacity, and the necessity to collaborate with non-governmental entities (in this case libraries throughout the country) to fulfill the agency’s mission. Throughout this paper, the author argued that scholars need to study this issue further since there is a need for scholarly literature to address the intergovernmental aspects of the GPO. Most importantly, the U.S government must work to develop a strategy to better carry out the important work of gathering, preserving, and disseminating U.S. government information to and for the people.
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