

# **Sea Grant Information Services and Publication Review**

*A subcommittee of the National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB)*

*March 17 2021*

## Committee Members:

Mr. Dale Baker (NSGAB co-chair), Dr. Gordon Grau (NSGAB co-chair), Dr. Kristen Fussell (Ohio Sea Grant), Ms. Anne Moser (Wisconsin Sea Grant), Ms. Sarah Whitney (Pennsylvania Sea Grant)

## National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) Staff Support:

Dr. Rebecca Briggs, Ms. Brooke Carney



## Introduction

A formal request for recommendations was given to the National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) from Dr. Jonathan Pennock, director of the National Sea Grant Program (Sea Grant). The request for recommendations was specifically to address programmatic needs in collecting, managing, and archiving Sea Grant research, education, extension, and communication information, tools, and products. The charge to the NSGAB was to create the a Sea Grant Information Services and Publication Review Committee to review and provide recommendations on two important issues: 1) the current and future information services Sea Grant will need to support its mission and 2) meeting the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Plan for Increasing Public Access to Research Results (PARR) requirements and publication policy. Specifically, the NSGAB was asked to assess 1) how the Sea Grant programs utilize the information services and catalog of the National Sea Grant Library (NSGL) and provide recommendations and management solutions related to several aspects of the NSGL, including the archive, the active digital library catalog, and the reporting and programmatic services provided by the staff at the NSGL and 2) how Sea Grant can implement the requirements of PARR to archive peer-reviewed publications with the NOAA Institutional Repository (IR) and identify the roles of the National Sea Grant Office (NSGO), NSGL, state Sea Grant programs, and funded researchers in meeting this federal requirement.

The Sea Grant Information Services and Publication Review Committee created by the NSGAB developed this recommendation document. Members of the committee are Dale Baker and Gordon Grau (NSGAB), Anne Moser (Wisconsin Sea Grant, Senior Special Librarian), Kristen Fussell (Ohio Sea Grant, Assistant Director of Administration and Research), and Sarah Whitney (Pennsylvania Sea Grant, Director). Rebecca Briggs and Brooke Carney (NSGO) oversaw the committee meetings.

From October 2020 to February 2021, the committee met numerous times. Committee members compiled and read numerous reports from the NSGL, the NOAA Library, and the NOAA IR, as well as additional background information. A survey was carried out with state Sea Grant programs on their use of, and how they valued the NSGL. The committee also had conversations with Jan Voogd (NSGL), Dee Clarkin (NOAA Library), Sarah Davis (NOAA Library-Bibliometrics), and Jennifer Fagan-Fry (NOAA IR). This final report was written in January-February 2021.

## History and Overview of the National Sea Grant Library

The National Sea Grant Library (NSGL) was established in 1970 and is the digital library and official archive for all Sea Grant documents and publications. According to the library's integrated library catalog, the holdings of the NSGL include more than 57,000 unique records. The digital collection includes as many as 80,000 documents that may be downloaded directly from the library catalog. The print collection includes the following types of documents: journal reprints, books, technical reports, maps, proceedings, newsletters, advisory reports, handbooks, curriculum guides, videos, CD-ROMs, computer programs, and other miscellaneous types of documents.

The NSGL is the only comprehensive collection of Sea Grant-produced documents from across the country, and it supports Sea Grant program goals by ensuring that Sea Grant information and publications are broadly accessible to researchers, students, teachers, policy makers, concerned citizens, and other audiences.

During the annual reporting period each year, all state Sea Grant programs are required to submit publications to the NSGL. Programs submit one or two hard copies of documents as well as digital copies of all publications. The state Sea Grant staff responsible for publication reporting fill out online cataloging forms for each submission. At the end of the reporting period, after verification and upload of all documentation, the NSGL provides reporting period statistics to the NSGO for each state Sea Grant program by publication type.

The NSGL is currently housed at the University of Rhode Island's (URI) Narragansett Bay Campus at the Ocean Science and Exploration Center. The staff currently includes a full-time credentialed librarian and a full-time library technician, positions funded by the NOAA grant, and a part-time assistant, funded by the URI. The NSGL was awarded ~\$300,000 in federal funds (with waived match requirement) per year for the past two years, and the current grant cycle for the NSGL ends 2/29/2022.

## **The National Sea Grant Library Today**

The current mission of the NSGL is the organization, access, and preservation of all documents created that have been funded by Sea Grant. With the rapid rate of technological advancement, however, it has become necessary to recognize that the landscape of research custody has changed and will only continue to change further. The current role of the NSGL is to archive and circulate the print collections, maintain a digital collection and provide library services such as research and reference services.

The archival role of the NSGL includes collecting and providing access to a comprehensive collection of print and/or digital materials including reports, publications, documents, and all types of media, gray literature, ephemera and other historical assets that reflect the more-than-50-year history of Sea Grant. These holdings include:

- 1) Peer-reviewed literature - the results of Sea Grant's research investment.
- 2) "Gray" literature - documents and materials published outside of traditional commercial or academic publishing and often not archived elsewhere. Examples of Sea Grant's gray literature collection may include reports, fact sheets, curricula, manuals, etc.
- 3) Ephemera and historical materials - historical materials may include photographs, correspondence, memos, etc., and are the primary sources that tell the history of Sea Grant. Ephemera may include items such as bookmarks or marketing materials that also contribute to the historical record of Sea Grant.

The NSGL attempts to collect all Sea Grant-funded publications, adding an average of 1,500 annually, with current total holdings of nearly 60,000 items.

The collection includes three categories:

- 1) Digital – approximately 80% of the print collection is digitized; the number of digital-only publications continues to increase.
- 2) Archival – a non-circulating print copy of every publication, held for posterity.
- 3) Circulating – a set of all print Sea Grant publications, available for borrowing.

The NSGL was once the sole home for Sea Grant research results but now many consortial digital repositories host digitized versions of Sea Grant work. Each state Sea Grant program uses the libraries and digital repositories of their home institutions in different ways, which may include a policy of depositing research results into these collections. In addition, most of these home institutions participate in consortial agreements with collections such as [HathiTrust](#) and [WorldCat](#), making thousands of Sea Grant documents readily available. However, there is no consistency across the Sea Grant network for making research results available at home institutions and because of this the NSGL is the only complete repository of materials across the Sea Grant network.

When the architecture for creating digital format information was first described in 1993, digital repositories were few. In fact, the NSGL was once on the forefront of digitizing research products for posterity and access, and it served the dispersed locations and activities of Sea Grant programs well. Time moves on, however, and the “silo” model of research custody represented by the NSGL is no longer a best practice, having been edged out by the “consortial” model, such as HathiTrust or WorldCat, both of which transcend geography as well as institutional affiliation. This is a fundamental and positive change for researchers because the fewer places researchers have to look for the information they need, the better served they are. Currently, for researchers to find NSGL holdings, they must look in the NSGL catalog. This is quite easily done, as long as researchers know to look there, but even so, it is yet another place for the researcher to remember to look. An associated extra step for the researcher, from the opposite direction, is the two-part requirement for submitting their work: to the NSGL and to NOAA.

The NSGL was once a groundbreaking enterprise, but today others have superseded many of its activities. This is a critical juncture for the NSGL. The question we face is whether the NSGL continue to do the following:

- Acquire, process, and maintain copies of all Sea Grant-funded research publications?
- Manage and expand the digital collection, and coordinate receipt of all born-digital documents supplied by the individual programs?
- Enhance the visibility of Sea Grant documents and provide access to Sea Grant information?
- Serve as the archival home for Sea Grant publications?

Do all these activities, as they are now, or if improved upon, best serve the Sea Grant programs, researchers, and the public?

## Survey Responses from Around the Sea Grant Network

The Sea Grant Association sent a survey to every program in the Sea Grant network asking the following questions:

- 1) Does your network currently access and actively use the library resources?
- 2) What is the most valuable resource/service(s) the library provides to you?
- 3) Are there valuable services not currently provided by the library that would make this service more useful to your network?
- 4) Do state programs archive/store much of the information currently submitted to the library? What roles are repeated?
- 5) Does Sea Grant need a national collection of topically focused Sea Grant materials? Is this service currently being met by another group or entity for your topical area?

Twenty-five responses were received from 20 of the 34 national Sea Grant programs including California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois/Indiana, Lake Champlain, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi-Alabama, Minnesota, MIT, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pacific Islands, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas and Washington.

Survey results are included in appendix A.

The survey results indicated an almost unanimous agreement about the importance of the archival value of the NSGL collection. Several programs mentioned that the library was possibly the only place to find all their program publications since inception. Throughout the responses, the difficulty of using the current library both for locating publications and for submitting publications was mentioned and reflects its antiquated system. Many mentioned the value of gray literature (which this committee has defined as program reports and other documents outside of published literature) and of historical ephemera, such as bookmarks, signage, pamphlets, etc.

In question three, programs listed services and collections currently missing from the NSGL. Their responses include suggestions for new features and best practices in library and archives that would possibly result if Sea Grant made a full investment to upgrade and maintain NSGL or another archival collection. (See the appendix A for the full range of suggestions.) Responses to question four indicate a lack of standardization with individual program archives and publication management across the 34 Sea Grant programs. Because each program handles publications archiving differently, publications may be difficult to locate or even unavailable to the public. Some programs prefer to manage and retain their historical materials, which can make locating historical materials challenging. The responses to question five indicate a strong interest in topical pages.

## Library Services Currently Available Within NOAA

The NOAA Central Library (<https://library.noaa.gov>) provides scientific, technical, and legislative information to all NOAA scientists, administrators, and others working in related disciplines in support of NOAA's programs. The NOAA Central Library is part of NOAA's Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR) Office of Science Support. Some of the programs that are part of the NOAA Central Library could benefit Sea Grant, specifically their institutional repository and their research and bibliometric services.

The NOAA Central Library provides NOAA researchers access to the resources of the NOAA Library and Information Network (which consists of 20 other NOAA libraries located across the United States) as well as access to scholarly publications. The NOAA Central Library collects materials in a wide variety of formats on a large number of subjects related to NOAA research, including environmental science, ecology, fisheries, geosciences, marine and freshwater biology, meteorological and atmospheric sciences, oceanography and limnology, and more. These include over 1,000 peer-reviewed journals and electronic databases. However, access to the electronic journals and databases requires a noaa.gov email address.

The NOAA Central Library's Institutional Repository (IR) (<https://library.noaa.gov/Research-Tools/IR/IR-FAQs>) is a digital library of scientific literature and research produced by NOAA. It was created in response to a White House Office of Science and Technology policy memorandum increasing access to the results of federally funded scientific research and the subsequent NOAA-authored plan to increase access to scholarly research carried out with NOAA funding titled "NOAA Plan for Increasing Public Access to Research Results" (PARR Plan). The NOAA IR ensures that NOAA-published research is preserved and made available for all present and future researchers, and allows for better assessment of the current and future impact of NOAA research. The NOAA IR is crawled by Google, which means that its publications show up in Google and Google Scholar searches. This makes it much easier for the public to find NOAA publications. It is also crawled by [Unpaywall](#), which is a browser extension used by academics, students, and researchers who want a simple way to locate open-access publications.

The NOAA Central Library's Research Services (<https://libguides.library.noaa.gov/research>) allows every NOAA employee and authorized contractor to request in-depth customized research products. This service was launched in 2018 and has since completed 100+ unique research projects for over 50 NOAA offices. The research team works closely with each customer to define and scope out research needs for the project. All services are provided at no additional charge as the library is partially funded through NOAA's Direct Bill.

Bibliometrics (<https://library.noaa.gov/Services/Bibliometrics>) are the quantitative analysis of academic publications. Using academic publications as a data source, bibliometric analysis attempts to provide a better understanding of how research is produced, organized, and interrelated. It also attempts to evaluate academic publications and sets of publications based on the number of citations these publications have received. Bibliometrics and citation analysis

is one way the NOAA Central Library is able to illustrate NOAA's status as producer of world-class research.

## Committee Recommendations

Based on the information reviewed, the committee looked at three possible options for the future model for the NSGL:

- 1) Maintain the current NSGL and bring it into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.
- 2) Merge the current NSGL into the NOAA Library and the NOAA IR.
- 3) Develop a hybrid model which maintains the NSGL but merges it to the extent possible with the NOAA Library and NOAA IR.

Each of the three options has its pros and cons. Nevertheless, we judge that current software at the NSGL is inadequate and cumbersome, and it thereby reduces the NSGL's use and value. The NOAA Library and IR infrastructure is cutting edge and user friendly. Independently updating the NSGL's software to the level already available within NOAA would come at a substantial cost and most likely be prohibitive. The PARR requirement means that all NOAA authors and grantees must submit their publications to the NOAA IR. At present, Sea Grant is not in compliance.

**The committee recommends, at least for the near term, a hybrid model for the NSGL (number 3). That is, merging the NSGL with the NOAA Library and IR to the extent possible. This would include all digital publications and holdings that are compatible with capabilities and practices of the NOAA Library/IR.**

We further recommend the following:

- 1) The National Sea Grant director delegate responsibility, authority and appropriate resources to an individual reporting to the director who would manage personnel involved in day-to-day operations of the NSGL and who would liaise with the management of the NOAA Library/IR. At present, it is unclear with whom responsibility lies. Is it with a program officer in the NSGO or someone in the NSGL or with the national director? This uncertainty is likely a major reason for the NSGL's current state of affairs.
- 2) The National Sea Grant College Program should continue to employ (a) professional librarian(s) to be responsible for strategic direction of the NSGL and its information portfolio and to undertake day-to-day NSGL operations. The committee recognizes that different advantages exist for locating this individual in the National Sea Grant Office, the NOAA Library/IR or a different site within the network. Employing two librarians, one for digital collections at the NOAA Central Library Silver Spring, and another in a site in the network for physical holdings is an option if financial resources are available. Holdings that are currently in archive form that may not be easily transferable, such as such as photographs and outreach ephemera, should continue to be held at the NSGL for their considerable historical value.

- 3) We recognize the proposed changes, specifically the transfer of the large database of holdings in the NSGL into the NOAA IR, will incur an initial upfront cost, including additional personnel expense for a limited period to ensure a successful transfer.
- 4) All “gray literature,” including a variety of extension and other outreach materials, should be digitized and made accessible. Among multiple benefits, this would avoid duplication of work and would provide a historical perspective on Sea Grant strategic directions.
- 5) Given that the NSGL is currently underused, a major effort marketing the new and up-to-date catalog of Sea Grant holdings within NOAA should be directed to the Sea Grant network and its stakeholders and partners. A side benefit would be acquainting audiences with the high impact of the network’s scholarship and outreach in delivering NOAA’s mission.
- 6) The NSGL/NOAA information services enterprise should be reviewed on a regular basis. The review could proceed over the same interval and concurrently with that of the network programs.
- 7) Streamline and clearly identify the process and requirements for reporting by Sea Grant programs to the NSGL/NOAA information services, including streamlining procedures for curation of materials into the NSGL collections, and specify consequences for non-compliance.
- 8) The NSGL should consider taking the lead on providing training for Sea Grant personnel across the network on issues related to collecting, managing, and archiving the Sea Grant portfolio of research, outreach and education publications. Topics might include an orientation for Sea Grant new personnel, Sea Grant’s obligation under PARR, open-access publishing, copyright, managing and using digital identifiers such as DOIs and ORCIDs, managing bibliographic resources and measuring research impact using Bibliometrics, and altmetrics.
- 9) Establish an advisory group for the NSGL and its associated information services. This advisory group should have meetings on a regular basis with the goal of assisting library staff with strategic planning and guidance on its operations in order to make the NSGL as effective and efficient as possible for Sea Grant programs.

The committee sees a number of advantages of merging NSGL with the NOAA Central Library. The large number and quality of NSGL holdings will demonstrate to NOAA the scholarly productivity and outreach capabilities Sea Grant brings to NOAA. NOAA IR publications are also discoverable in Google searches. This will greatly increase the discoverability and visibility of Sea Grant’s research investment and its deep portfolio of documents and publications for all Sea Grant audiences, including the public.

The inability of the NSGL to keep abreast of changing Library technology, primarily because of the high cost, will be eliminated. Addressing any federal rules changes would also fall to the NOAA Library. Sea Grant will benefit from the cutting-edge technology available with NOAA Library/IR whose costs are shared NOAA-wide. Redundancy of data input by network programs may also be able to be reduced by a centrally located database.



## **Executive Summary**

The Sea Grant Information Services and Publication Review Committee was created to provide recommendations on how to meet current and future Sea Grant information needs as well as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Plan for Increasing Public Access to Research Results (PARR) requirements and publication policy.

The National Sea Grant Library (NSGL) was established in 1970 and is the digital library and official archive for all Sea Grant documents and publications. The NSGL was once a groundbreaking enterprise, but today many of its activities have been superseded by others and its technology has become seriously outdated. A survey sent to all Sea Grant programs found almost unanimous agreement about the archival value of the NSGL collection but also agreement about the difficulty of using its antiquated system.

NOAA provides many resources, including a central library, institutional repository of publications produced by NOAA, research services and bibliometrics – all within a system that is cutting edge and user friendly.

The committee determined that current software at the NSGL is inadequate and cumbersome, and independently updating the NSGL's software to the level already available within NOAA would come at a cost that is most likely prohibitive. Therefore, the committee recommends, at least for the near future, merging the NSGL with the NOAA Library and IR to the extent possible.

The inability of the NSGL to keep abreast of changing library technology, primarily because of cost, will be eliminated. Addressing any federal rules changes would also fall to the NOAA Library. Sea Grant will benefit from the cutting-edge technology available with NOAA Library/IR whose costs are shared NOAA-wide. Redundancy of data input by network programs may also be reduced by a centrally located database.

## Appendix A

### Information Services and Publications Review Sub-Committee Summary of responses from the Sea Grant Network January 18, 2021

Twenty-five responses were received from 20 of the 34 national Sea Grant programs including California, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois/Indiana, Lake Champlain, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi-Alabama, Michigan, MIT, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Pacific Islands, South Carolina, Texas and Washington.

For the purposes of this summary, an archive is defined as a comprehensive print and/or digital collection of materials including reports, publications, documents, all types of media, gray literature, ephemera and other historical assets that reflect the more than 50-year history of the National Sea Grant College Program. A repository is a narrower term defined as a centralized collection of documents, reports, publications, data and other resources, primarily in digital format.

#### Summary

This survey of Sea Grant programs around the entire network indicates an almost unanimous agreement about the importance of the archival value of the NSGL collection. Several programs mentioned that the library was possibly the only place to find all their program publications since inception. Throughout the responses, the difficulty of using the current library workflows is mentioned and reflects its antiquated system. Many mentioned the value of gray literature (which this committee has defined as program reports and other documents outside of published literature) and of historical ephemera, such as bookmarks, signage, pamphlets etc.

In question three, programs listed services and collections currently missing from NSGL. Their responses include best practices in library and archives that would possibly result if SG makes a full investment to upgrade and maintain NSGL or another archival collection. Responses to question four indicate a lack of standardization with individual program archives and publication management across the 34 Sea Grant programs. This raises concerns for programs wanting to manage and retain their historical materials as well as to provide access to current publications. The responses to question five indicate a strong interest in topical pages.

Note about question five: In this editor's experience, topical collections are a discoverability question and would be a product that could be a valuable result of the investment in a fully-funded Sea Grant archive. The first step in creating a robust topical collection is assigning permanent URLs (such as DOI numbers) to assets that would be included in the collection. With those permanent URLs, topical pages can be created without worry of broken or outdated links. With an investment in an archive of materials for Sea Grant, this becomes a much easier task and could easily be managed by library or information professionals.

## DETAILED SUMMARY

### QUESTION ONE - Does your network currently access and actively use the library resources?

Of the 25 respondents, two did not answer this question. Of the remaining 23 responses, two said they do not use the library and one replied not sure. Of the 20 users of library resources, several included their purpose in accessing the library collections:

- for **exhibit** development (1)
- for **archiving** our program reports and publications (7)
- for **researching the origins** of their state program (2) (including an anecdote about locating unknown history and a new date for the founding of their program)
- for **researching publications on a topic across the national Sea Grant network** (6), including a retrospective about funded research

Note: One program said that they did not feel they received the expected results in their search of the library catalog but noted they were unsure of the reason and mentioned the possibility of operator error.

### QUESTION TWO - What is the most valuable resource/service the library provides to you?

Of the 25 respondents, three did not answer this question. The twenty-two respondents mentioned the following resources/services of value:

- **Search** capability [of the library catalog] (3)
- **Archival function** of the library collection (17) with these notes:
  - Valued having **permanent, central, open source repository** across programs (3)
    - Especially inclusion of extension/education publications (1)
    - To avoid duplication (2)
    - That provides access to Sea Grant investment back to the 1970s (1)
    - Valued having access to older **print** collection (5), to **digital** collection (2)
    - **One small SG program** is dependent on the library for its archiving (1)
- The ability to provide **access to the copyrighted materials** to the public (2)
- **Library reporting** to national office (1)
- **Expertise of library professionals** (2)

### QUESTION THREE - Are there valuable services not currently provided by the library that would make this service more useful to your network?

Of the 25 respondents, three did not answer this question and one said it was “beyond my position to comment.” The 21 responses to this question suggested the following services (and collections –ed.) would be useful. Some of these suggestions are not services provided by the library but rather procedures for using and managing the library and for other publication-related workflows:

- **Video** storage (2)
- An **oral history** collection (1)
- **Full digital** repository (2)
- A more **up-to-date, innovative library infrastructure** including (4)
  - Better metadata/keywords and search functionality (3)
  - Citation and usage metrics (4)
  - Data on library usage and document downloads for their state program (1)
    - Ability to integrate library search button into state program website (and more broadly integrate with state programs... for example, using library repository for local pubs warehouse) (3)
- Better **marketing** of the library, which may include (2)
  - Spotlight on new pubs, social media, webinars, branding
- Have library staff attend **Sea Grant week** (1)
- Have library handle **numbering**: assign DOIs, use ORCID nos., Google school nos. and reconcile numbering system between local programs and library (why are there two different systems?) (1)
- Better **coordination** between NSGO and library (1)
- Ability to **edit own library records** (1)
- **Library training** on such issues as how to cite publications, how to store digital and print documents on site, etc. (1)
- Properly **fund publications across SG** – fund both the library function and publication management at the local level (1)
- Create publications **working group** (1)
- Include a **data** repository in library (1)
- **Difficult to respond** to this question because only understand archival purpose and don't understand how the library is used (5)
- **None** that I can think of (4)

#### **QUESTION FOUR - Do state programs archive/store much of the information currently submitted to the library? What roles are repeated?**

Of the 25 respondents, three did not answer this question. The twenty-two responses were:

- Yes (18) with the following comments
  - At our **institute archives** (1)
  - We assign **more metadata than the library** (2)
  - Seems to be some **redundancy** – no additional details (1)

- We store **both** print and digital (2).
- PIER and metrics reporting seems redundant (1)
- Two different **numbering** systems (1)
- **Repeated roles** include numbering, database input, hard copy storage, two different databases (1)
- Has a print collection and an external hard drive for electronic publications. The **NSGL submittal provides their program their only complete program archive.** (1)
- Yes but **their publications are not public facing.** Repetition: storage of publications (1)
- Appreciate ability to post dissertations, theses, manuscripts to NSGL (ed note: **copyrighted materials?**) (1)
- **A variety of practices over time.** Older materials sent to state library but are not digitized and are not very discoverable. Some are found in NSGL and not in home library. Since 2000 program working with institution library to improve this. Since 2017 using institution library to store digital files of program materials for back up. (1)
- Has some materials online but it appears to mostly be a **citation list.** Their pdfs are in folders on a server. They did a redesign and their website now reflects their program, not a dump of all their work, historical and current. Internal pubs database only holds title, authors, etc. (1)
- **Historical materials are not stored locally.** (1)
- **Some publications** but not all and not public. No repeated roles. Their home institutions don't necessarily support Sea Grant program.
- **Historical materials may only be stored in the NSGL** (or There are singular copies of older documents in the NSGL (2)
- **Storing less and less** of older materials as time moves on and space becomes an issue. (1)
- One program framed their response so it sounded like "records" – not exactly sure how to capture (1)
- No (2)
- Not sure (2)
  - One program mentioned the recent loss of an archivist. No details.

Note: Two responses included the important of the NSGL librarians.

**QUESTION FIVE - Does Sea Grant need a national collection of topically focused SG materials? Is this service currently being met by another group or entity for your topical area?**

Of the 25 respondents, two did not answer this question and one said it was "beyond their role." The twenty-two responses included:

- Would be a **nice feature** and not sure if this is currently available (3)
  - Does Bridge serve this purpose for education publications? Side question: I am retiring – where do I send my publications and personal archive? (1)

- Make sure it is marketing internally and externally
- Would be **helpful** (8)
  - ...expand to include oral histories and history of Sea Grant (1)
  - And library could create topical lists
  - One stop shop for finding materials, increased discoverability beyond state/region (2)
- **Absolutely and no one else is doing this** (7)
  - Must include upgrade library website (1)
  - If not NGSL then who? Better than 34 random configurations, need standardization.
    - Uses journal databases for research publications but what about SG publications and gray literature? (1)
  - Would foster communication across programs, this is the SG resource collection
  - If you can't access our work, it is wasted
  -
- **Seems useful but more for extension staff** (1)
- Seems like this is **already possibly** by NGSO using computer program to pull from 34 program websites (1)
- Depends upon **commitment to the resource**. Needs to have better submittal processes. Shared several examples of topical collections all across Sea Grant network. (1)
- **Could be phenomenal but the process is so burdensome** that staff have given up. Mentioned that some home universities are eliminating storage space, making a central storage for SG a better option. (1)

Note: One program added a comment about accessibility rules. "We had to drop a document from our website because it doesn't meet new accessibility rules being enforced by our U. It is a document the tribes use for guidance on collecting scientific data on wild rice. We had archived this with the library and so were able to simply provide the link to the document on library website. So it is still available to them while we work to make the document meet accessibility rules."