

Meeting Notes

Interior Museum Property Committee Meeting

9:00 AM -- 3:00 PM, Wednesday, March 2, 2005; Room 7000B, Main Interior Building

The next meeting will be scheduled when events warrant. Meanwhile, work of the Interior Museum Property Committee (IMPC) will continue through subordinate working groups and through e-mail and telephonic communications.

These final notes were prepared following review by meeting participants. They will be posted on the IMP web pages at this URL <http://museums.doi.gov/impc.html>.

Ron Wilson opened the March 2 meeting at 9:00 a.m. with introductions. Emily Shillingburg assisted Ron with note-taking. Meeting participants are listed below.

BIA	Emily Shillingburg	202-501-5946
BLM	Stephanie Damadio (part,via phone)	916-978-4650
FWS	No representative available	
IACB	No representative available	
MMS	No representative available	
NPS	Terry Childs	202-354-2125
	Brian Biegler (for John Roberts)	202-354-2009 (J.R.)
OS/NBC	David McKinney	202-208-7017
OS/PAM	Donald R. Cumberland	202-208-4698
	Ronald C. Wilson	202-208-3438
OS/PFM	Charlene Hutchinson (a.m.)	202-208-3964
OS/OST	David Pradt	505-816-1084
Reclamation	Myra Giesen	785-843-0160
	Wanda Walker (via phone)	406-247-7702
USGS	Joanna Bloch (via phone)	703-648-7326
	Allan Montgomery (via phone)	703-648-7321

UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Following introductions, Ron Wilson announced that schedule conflicts required some re-sequencing of the agenda. Teresa Barry (OS/PAM) attended the concurrent meeting of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB).

IMP WORK GROUPS

Training and Technical Assistance

IMP Training

Donald Cumberland reported the following IMP training and technical assistance information:

Courses Scheduled for 2005:

Distance Learning Module, Web Based Training: “Introduction to Managing Museum Property”

This approximately 45 minute module will be administered by DOI University. An IMP training committee has finished developing the text for the module and will be assembling and developing graphics to illustrate the text. Completion is expected during FY2005.

Managing Museum Property – March Session

This course will take place in San Diego, CA on March 14-18, 2005. This course will be hosted by the San Diego Museum of Man.

Managing Museum Property – August Session

Because of a large response to our announcement for the March session, a second course will take place in San Diego, CA on August 15-19, 2005. This course will be again hosted by the San Diego Museum of Man.

Curating Natural History Collection

This course is a collaborative effort with the NPS Museum Management Program and the Denver Museum of Nature and Science. This 36-hour course is planned for May 9-13, 2005 and will take place at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science. Additional information on the course will appear on our website in the near future.

Courses Under Development:

Managing Archives and Official Records

This course is a collaborative effort with the NPS Museum Management Program. The IMP expects to conduct this 24-hour course no later than FY2006. Donald Cumberland agreed to send an e-mail query to IMPC representatives to identify specific issues and concerns they may have regarding course content.

FWS Specific Training on Managing FWS Museum Property

This 16-24 hour training may occur in FY2005 or FY2006.

Reclamation-specific Training on Managing Reclamation Museum Property

A bureau-specific course may be requested by Reclamation. Myra Giesen will coordinate requirements with Donald Cumberland following Reclamation's museum property working subgroup meeting in April 2005.

IMP Technical Assistance

Museum Planning Site Visits:

NPS Fort Scott National Historic Site -- to develop a collection storage plan for the site

USGS Reston Central Office -- to provide collection storage planning assistance

Year-End Equipment and Supply Purchases

With funds remaining after the IMP's training projects, IMP will purchase museum equipment (museum cabinetry, shelving, environmental monitor devices, etc.) and museum supplies (archival items such as folders, photo enclosures, storage boxes, etc.) for bureau units and central offices. Donald Cumberland advised IMPC bureau representatives to refer to *Tools of the Profession* for descriptions and uses of these items. Bureau requests should be submitted to him as soon as possible so he can start compiling purchase orders.

UPDATES ON MANAGEMENT CONTEXTS

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB)

The agenda for the March 2, 2005 FASAB meeting included finalizing Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) #29 – Heritage Assets and Stewardship Land: Reclassification from Required Supplementary Stewardship Information. SFFAS #29 consolidates all financial standards for heritage assets and stewardship land, and changes Required Supplemental Stewardship Information (RSSI) to “basic information” subject to stricter audit standards. Several IMPC representatives expressed continuing concern that FASAB has not fully included discipline and program staffs in planning for the transition.

Paragraphs 24-26 of the draft standard require the disclosures and required supplementary information. **Note that this text is from the final draft and may change slightly before release in final form by FASAB.**

24. Entities with significant heritage assets should reference a note on the balance sheet that discloses information about heritage assets, but no asset dollar amount should be shown. The note disclosure related to significant heritage assets should provide the following:

- a. A concise statement explaining how significant heritage assets are important to*

- the overall mission of the entity, or are pertinent due to mandates such as compliance with laws and regulations or that Congress has determined the heritage assets to be nationally significant.*
- b. A brief description of the entity's stewardship policies for heritage assets.*
 - c. A concise description of each major category of heritage asset. The appropriate level of categorization of heritage assets should be meaningful and determined by the preparing based on the entity's mission, types of heritage assets, and how it manages the assets.*
 - d. Heritage assets should be quantified in terms of physical units. The appropriate level of aggregation and physical units of measure for each category should be meaningful and determined by the preparer based on the entity's mission, types of heritage assets, and how it manages the assets. For each major category of heritage asset (identified in c. above) the following should be reported:*
 - 1) The number of physical units by major category; major categories should be classified by collection or non-collection type heritage assets for the which the entity is the steward as of the end of the reporting period;*
 - 2) The number of physical units by major category that were acquired and/or withdrawn during the reporting period; and*
 - 3) A description of the major methods of acquisition and withdrawal of significant heritage assets during the reporting period. This should include disclosure of the number of physical units (by major category) of transfers of heritage assets between Federal entities and the number of physical units (by major category) of heritage assets acquired through donation or devise, if material. In addition, the fair value of heritage assets acquired through donation or devise during the reporting period should be disclosed, if known and material.*

25. Entities should report the condition of the heritage assets (which may be reported with the deferred maintenance information) as required supplementary information. Entities should include a reference to the condition and deferred maintenance information if reported elsewhere in the report containing the basic financial statements.

26. Entities should disclose that multi-use heritage assets are recognized and presented with general PP&E in the basic financial statements and that additional information for the multi-use heritage assets is included with the heritage assets information.

Paragraph 56 of the new standard states, *“The Board believes that information on heritage assets and stewardship land (except for condition) should be basic information for the following reasons:*

- a. Information on these assets is essential to fair presentation and crucial to understanding the entirety of an entity's financial condition.*
- b. Accounting for heritage assets and stewardship land requires more audit scrutiny than would be afforded if it were considered RSI.*
- c. This classification is consistent with existing standards issued by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) that is specific to*

reporting on art and historical treasures; and the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) that is specific to collections, and other works of art and historical treasures. There is also existing audit guidance available in this area.”

It is anticipated that the new standard will be released by Summer 2005 with only minor edits to the final draft considered at the March 2 FASAB meeting. It will be posted at this URL when it is released -- <http://www.fasab.gov/standards.html>. The final draft states that in **Paragraph 77**, “*This standard does not eliminate any information that was previously required for heritage assets and stewardship land. In drafting the standard, the Board envisioned the required disclosures to be presented in a concise format similar to the format that most entities present for general property, plant and equipment.*”

2005 ANNUAL REPORTING

Charlene Hutchinson, Office of Financial Management (PFM) reported on plans for preparing the Department of the Interior’s Performance and Accountability Report (PAR) for FY2005. Key milestones for reporting FY2005 performance and accountability data were provided in a December 27, 2004 memorandum from the Assistant Secretary – Policy, Management and Budget.

In view of the FASAB changes, it is anticipated that the information formerly reported as RSSI will be reduced in volume by at least 50%. Debra Carey (PFM) has been assigned the task of coordinating implementation of SFFAS #29. Interior’s implementation of SFFAS #29 will likely proceed in advance of the effective dates prescribed by FASAB.

The PFM staff wants to ensure that data presented in the PAR can withstand audit scrutiny. In the past, Interior has not explained clearly that the reported size of its collections is a combination of precise information on cataloged museum items and imprecise estimates of uncataloged museum items. While experiences of several bureaus have shown the estimates to be accurate representations of the order of magnitude of the uncataloged collections, estimates do not represent the precision that exist for cataloged items.

Charlene Hutchinson asked the IMPC bureau representatives to consider potential options for streamlining museum data reported in the PAR. She stated there will not be a joint PFM/PAM call memo this year. PFM and PAM will issue separate call memos recognizing the distinction between data required for financial reporting and data required for management oversight functions of the two departmental offices.

PFM will instruct bureaus to enter data directly into Hyperion (referenced in previous call memos as the Citrix Server). PFM will extract the data from Hyperion rather than use the pre-screened museum data provided by PAM in the past. PAM will continue to collect data prescribed in 411DM. To ensure a continuous set of comparable data, PAM will use the same museum property reporting templates that have been used in recent years.

Reclamation's representative challenged the need for continuous data sets, preferring to limit reporting to data for the PAR and for meeting requirements prescribed in Part 411 of the Departmental Manual. IMP staff believes continuous data sets are required to fulfill PAM's museum program oversight responsibilities.

Bureau representatives asked that the due date for the Bureau Museum Property Management Summary Report be realigned with the January 30 due date established in 411DM. Ron Wilson agreed to discuss the option with PAM managers. The decision will appear in the data call for the Bureau Museum Property Management Summary Report. At the time these notes were finalized, PFM and PAM staffs were still evaluating the relationships between data collected by the two offices.

IMPC DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS FOR REPORTING MUSEUM PROPERTY DATA

In response to a question about the term "entity" to which SFFAS #29 gives discretion to decide reporting format, etc., Charlene Hutchinson confirmed that all Interior bureaus will be expected to report consistently the data and formats prescribed by Office of the Secretary offices. Data in bureau reports must be consistent with the data reported in the Department's PAR, though bureaus have the option of providing more detail than will appear in the PAR.

Currently reported museum data that are fully auditable include the number of cataloged items. Interior could give more emphasis to the number of cataloged items and more emphasis to explaining that the other 60% of our total collection size is based on "best-available" estimates of the uncataloged items. Item-level accountability has been established only for cataloged items. Item-level auditing of uncataloged items is not possible because cataloging is the process that establishes item-level accountability. Cataloged items are fully auditable.

Would "number of accessions" be a viable option? An "accession" is defined as an item or group of items acquired from the same source at the same time. While the number of current-year accessions should be accurate, many bureaus have large backlogs of collections that have not been formally accessioned. Several bureaus have immature museum programs with infrastructures that would be unable to report the number of accessions for all years. This should not be surprising given that mandates requiring this of federal agencies have been in place for only 15 years while collections have been accumulating for much longer. Some bureaus have cataloged collections that have not been formally accessioned. Since an accession may include a single item or millions of items, reporting "number of accessions" would not meet the FASAB requirement to provide meaningful information.

Wanda Walker suggested that further guidance is needed on accessioning pre-existing collections. Ron Wilson stated that existing guidance in 411DM and the Museum Property Handbooks are sufficient. Further clarifications can be obtained through IMP training and technical assistance programs. Since cataloging is the process that

establishes item-level accountability, incomplete accession records do not prevent the items from being reported among the bureau's cataloged collections.

Would “number of collections” be a viable option? There is no standard use of the term “collection” within the museum profession or within the Department. The term is used informally to refer to the whole group of items in a particular agency, bureau, unit, location, project or site. It may refer to a set or subset of a particular discipline, the work of a particular artist, or to items within a genre of art. It may refer to items acquired from a particular field season, from a specific donor, or to a specific series of archival documents. For Interior's GPRA reports, the term collection relates to the number of locations (facilities). All of these uses have meaning within the limited context of their typical use, but lack meaning as a reporting unit.

Reporting number of collections is equivalent to reporting the number of financial account balances without providing any account balances. It would be equally accurate to report that the Department has a single collection, eight bureau or office collections, or uncounted thousands of other permutations such as number of archeological sites from which collection items were acquired, the number of field locations from which natural science specimens were removed, etc. Since the use of the term “collection” is informal, we currently do not have counts on hand that could be easily reported. The same informality would make the data unsuitable for auditing.

Other concerns raised during the discussion include the difficulty of reporting additions and withdrawals. It would be possible to add or remove millions of items within a single collection or among a stable number of collections, and still report zero as the number of additions and withdrawals. Such reporting would not meet the FASAB requirement to provide meaningful information, and would be counter to standard profession practice.

Would “number of locations” be a viable option? We currently report the number of facilities that house bureau collections as part of the Bureau Museum Property Summary Report, and as a GPRA performance measure related to the Department's Strategic Plan. This is a variation within the “number of collections” approach. Some IMPC members noted that multiple bureaus have museum property in the same institution. Should that be counted as “one” or as the number of bureaus with collections at that location? Management decisions about the property are made by separate bureau managers. There are other situations where one or more bureaus may have collections in different departments of the same university. Would you count the location as “one,” as the number of departments housing collections, or as a multiple of the number of departments times the number of bureaus housing their property there? Current practice links reporting in such cases to the management authority for the museum items housed at each location, as determined by individual bureau museum programs.

In further discussion, bureau representatives emphasized that we must look at existing data sets rather than attempt to create new ones. Because of the status of existing documentation and management systems in several bureaus, it is not possible to sort the data in new ways in a timely manner. ***The only precise data set currently available is***

the number of museum property items that have been cataloged.

Condition data continue to be required for reporting in the PAR. We reviewed discussion during the December meeting regarding validity of our condition assessments, and confirmed our conclusion that the current approach is the most practical. All IMPC bureau representatives agreed that it is not possible to obtain new item-level condition data on 100 to 150 million items each year. Our best indication of condition is using our checklist to evaluate spaces housing collections against 411 DM standards. If spaces housing collections are stable, the objects themselves have a better chance of being in stable condition.

Our current assessments for condition of spaces housing museum collections are 1) “good” means meeting >70% of Department of the Interior preservation and protection standards (411DM), 2) “fair” means meeting 50 - 69% of 411DM standards, and 3) “poor” means meeting <50% of the standards. Since all facilities have not been assessed by Interior bureaus, we also allow use of scores recorded by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Mandatory Center of Expertise for Curation and Management of Archeological Collections. In addition, institutions that are accredited by the American Association of Museums may be reported as being in “fair” condition if Interior of Corps of Engineers scores are not available.

Ron Wilson noted that the new SFFAS #29 (Paragraph 24 a&b) requires discussion of how heritage assets are important to the overall mission of the reporting entity, are pertinent due to mandates such as compliance with laws and regulations, and stewardship policies for heritage assets. It will be easier for preparers of the Department’s PAR if bureaus use common language to describe the government-wide and department-wide policies. Bureaus will still need to add bureau-specific stewardship policies to this common language. The group agreed that common language is desirable and that Ann Hitchcock would be a good person to draft it if she is willing to do so. Following the meeting, she agreed to accept the assignment.

Financial and Business Management System

Ron Wilson encouraged IMPC representatives to monitor progress on the Department’s Financial and Business Management System (FBMS) at this URL: <http://www.doi.gov/fbms/>. The need for FBMS to aggregate museum data efficiently for reporting requires that an interface be designed to capture the data from the museum systems that contain the data. Responses to the 2004 management control questionnaire indicated that dozens of museum systems are currently in use, many of which do not meet 411 DM standards.

At the March 1, 2005 meeting of the DOI Investment Review Board (IRB), Debra Sonderman presented a mission needs statement proposing development of a single Interior Collections Management System based on the bests of the various bureau customizations or Re:discovery collections management software. The IRB approved the mission needs statement, authorizing us to develop an Exhibit 300-1 for the project. The proposed project is very near the beginning of the Department’s Capital Planning and

Investment Control (CPIC) process. Few answers to questions surrounding the project were immediately available. The mission needs statement was distributed to IMPC representatives following the meeting. Information about the CPIC process is available at this URL: <http://www.doi.gov/ocio/cp/index.html>.

Several IMPC bureau representatives may receive requests over the next few weeks for information required for the Exhibit 300-1, which must be completed by mid-April 2005. You can also find the “high level schedule” (under Calendar of Events at the URL above) that identifies other key milestones and due dates.

Draft Proposed Legislation

Ron Wilson stated that he believes now is not the right time to proceed with drafting proposed legislation to expand bureau collection management authorities. Previous discussions have confirmed that it is more important to get it right than to rush forward with a draft that does not meet our needs. Among the reasons cited for tabling the action now are 1) the current budget climate could increase risk of unwise decisions, and 2) management changes are anticipated in the IMP chain of command.

Ron Wilson stated the Interior Museum Program does not object to Reclamation seeking bureau-specific legislation so long as it is consistent with 411 DM standards and other professional mandates.

BUREAU MUSEUM PROGRAM UPDATES

Bureau of Indian Affairs (Emily Shillingburg)

- **Non-Federal Repository Partnership.** BIA is partnering with the Gila River Indian Community and the Arizona State Museum to physically transfer BIA-controlled archeological materials to the tribe’s heritage center for management and will allow for the immediate access to materials significant to the tribe. The transfer will be a two-year process, with the first transfer of materials to occur at the end of March 2005.
- **BIA Field Office Inventory.** BIA is gearing up for the annual inventory for museum property in BIA field offices. This is the third year since the inventory procedures were implemented and the process is now standard for field property officers.
- **Guidance Handbook.** BIA is working on a Heritage Asset reporting manual designed to incorporate all reporting requirements for cultural resources, including the Performance and Accountability Report, which will incorporate new FASAB standards when established, GPRA goals, the Annual Report to Congress on Archeological Activities, Preserve America, Museum Property Summary Report, and BIA cultural resource management oversight for field operations.

- **Funding News.** Cultural Resources, which includes Museum Property, now has a dedicated accounting line. This is an important tool that help will improve efficiency of project implementation and allow for improved planning to address Strategic Plan initiatives and accountability deficiencies. For FY 2005, a zero-based budget and financial plan were prepared and funded for staff salaries, travel, operating costs, and specific projects to address the cataloging backlog.
- **Staff Changes.** Carolyn McClellan accepted a position with the Bureau of Land Management last November. There are plans to announce a NAGPRA Coordinator vacancy in the next several months. In the interim, Donald Sutherland, Chief Archeologist, and Emily Shillingburg, Museum Specialist, are sharing NAGPRA responsibilities.

National Park Service (Ann Hitchcock) (*new items since last report in italics*):

- Establishing significance criteria [to be discussed at the NPS Museum Management Council meeting in April 2005]
- Developing a museum award named after Ralph Lewis
- Developing a generic repository agreement for natural history collections
- Integrating museum management and the incident command system, **participation in development of Emergency Support Function #11 as part of the National Response Plan**
- Participating in development of the incident management analysis and reporting system that NPS is leading for DOI
- Improving documentation for museum management staffing needs
- NPS museum centennial 2004-2005 activities—*exhibit, The Power of Context: NPS Museums at 100 Years, opened at DOI Museum February 3; presenting panel on museum centennial at George Wright Society Conference in March; see web site at <http://www.cr.nps.gov/museum/centennial>, which has monthly Featured Treasures and conservation tips.*
- *Opened exhibit on January 18 at DOI Museum—“Inauguration: An Evolving Tradition”*
- Converting paper catalog records to ANCS+
- Maintaining an agreement with American Type Culture Collection to serve as repository for biological collections in cryogenic storage, *first annual review held March 2, 2005*
- **Proposing revisions to AAM regarding accreditation procedures for NPS**
- **Renewing policy, DO#24 NPS Museum Collections**
- *Revising policy, DO28, Cultural Resources*
- *Undertaking service-wide management review of implementation of deaccessioning and annual inventory procedures in parks*
- *Maintaining the Web Catalog, one park added bringing the total to 19*

U.S. Geological Survey (Allan Montgomery)

- Acquired additional storage space for collections at the USGS National Center in Reston, Virginia
- Requested Donald Cumberland review USGS storage facilities and design a storage plan using recently purchased museum storage cabinets
- Having objects cleaned and treated at the Harpers Ferry Center's Division of Conservation
- Continues to seek and add objects associated with the history of USGS
- Continues to collect and catalog natural history specimens for the collection.
- Providing collection and historic preservation documentation to the Federal Preservation Institute's Preservation Learning Portal. This portal will also incorporate the USGS Geo-spatial One-Stop site as well.

Bureau of Reclamation (Myra Giesen)

- A newly established Museum Property Working Subgroup made up of regional representatives and the Office of Program and Policy Services (OPPS) met for the first time in November 2004 and will meet again in April 2005; the group is product oriented
- Reclamation's bureau-level Scope of Collections Statement (SOCS) has been revised from a 20-page document to a single paragraph, with details formerly in the SOCS to be incorporated into a new bureau Museum Property Management Plan.
- Drafts of Museum Property Management Policy and Museum Property Management Directives and Standards are nearing internal peer review
- Anticipates moving forward with bureau-specific legislation initiative (at the urging of bureau managers), if IMP does not produce a legislative draft this month. [*The IMP Chair reminded Reclamation that the draft must include appropriate procedural safeguards consistent with 41IDM requirements and with government-wide ethical standards of 41CFR101-43 to 101-46.--RCW*]
- Delivery of Reclamation-customized Re:discovery collection management software delayed several weeks due to problems with the Oracle platform; training will be delayed until after the FY2005 reporting cycle.
- It is likely that Reclamation will be seeking another solicitor's opinion on the topic of ownership. The issue of ownership has been raised regarding control of NAGPRA cultural items. Reclamation feels resolution of ownership must be resolved before it can assume any NAGPRA responsibilities for collections with ambiguous ownership status.
- A memorandum to the Secretary is in the surnaming process that addresses Reclamation's continuing concerns with overlapping reporting requirements, and requests review with an eye toward streamlining reporting requirements.
- OPPS is refining bureau tables for collectible and non-collectible heritage assets

information.

Indian Arts and Crafts Board (Ron Wilson)

- Hired a new curator for the Southern Plains Indian Museum in Anadarko, Oklahoma.
- The President's Budget for FY2006 includes language authorizing the IACB to seek partnerships for managing its three museums, allowing IACB staff to focus other aspects of the IACB mission responsibilities for enforcing the Indian Arts and Crafts Act.

Other bureaus were invited to submit written updates to be added to these notes.

Discussion of Bureau Reports

A general discussion of partnership with Interior's non-federal partners was raised throughout the bureau reports. A working group chaired by Emily Shillingburg was created to seek and propose ways to streamline and improve interactions with non-federal partners. Other working group members are Myra Giesen and Eugene Marino.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Department's Asset Management Plan (AMP) is still in draft form. It primarily addresses real property, but also affects heritage assets. Each bureau has a representative on the planning team. If you need more details, contact Terri Barry at 200-208-4328.

There were several questions about whether or not the AMP adequately addresses heritage assets. What is the relationship between the APM, MAXIMO, and the Facility Management Software System? How are museums addressed in the context of facility management? Are the standards unique to museum spaces addressed? Do the systems distinguish among facilities that serve as stand-alone museums, other buildings that contain dedicated museum spaces such as collections management space, exhibit space, etc.? Ron Wilson agreed to ask Terri Barry for clarification on these issues.

OWNERSHIP OF COLLECTIONS

Emily Shillingburg requested more discussion on ownership of museum collections, Ron Wilson reminded the group that the opinion obtained a few years ago concluded that such decisions are highly dependant on case-specific information. There are few cases where a blanket answer applicable to broad sets of collections can be expected. He expressed the view that ownership of Interior's collections fall along a continuum. At one end there is no question that Interior is responsible. At the other end there is no question that Interior is not the responsible party. In the middle, there is a gray area in which additional case-specific research is required to determine responsibility definitively. Given the limited resources available to Interior bureaus, work often is limited to the end of the continuum where there is no question. As progress continues, the gray area can be

researched and resolved as the need arises. It makes little sense to expend resources on collections in the gray area when collections in the undisputed area require the available resources. Since accessioning is the formal process that brings property into the museum property management realm, it is also the process that can draw the boundary between the known and gray areas of the continuum. Ownership issues should be resolved before such property is accessioned.

CURATION AGREEMENTS

In response to a question from the IMP Chair, IMPC bureau representatives agreed that it would be useful to collect and share examples of curation agreements (i.e., cooperative agreements, contracts, and memorandum of understanding) used by various bureaus. Ron Wilson agreed to request samples from the IMPC for sharing with the group.