

## PART 2 PERFORMANCE SECTION

### Measuring and Reporting Our Performance

This annual performance report is based on the goals, strategies, and long-range performance targets in our Strategic Plan and the specific objectives in our FY 2005 Annual Performance Plan. The following pages detail our performance on all our FY 2005 objectives. Checked boxes indicate those we fully achieved. Those we did not fully achieve have open boxes with an explanation below. We also included relevant performance results and trend information. Our budget is linked to the report's performance goals. We received no aid from non-Federal parties in preparing this report.

We used four mechanisms to measure actual performance: (1) periodic management reviews, (2) formal audits of operations, (3) expansion and refinement of our performance measurement system, and (4) systematic sampling of measurement system effectiveness. In FY 1999 we deployed our agency-wide Performance Measurement and Reporting System (PMRS). This system allows us to define and consistently measure data critical to the analysis of our performance objectives. Every year we improve and expand the system further so that our strategic performance is measured using more of a balanced scorecard approach for tracking cycle times, quality, productivity, cost, and customer satisfaction for our products and services. This report also updates some of our FY 2004 statistics that were corrected as a result of these improvements. These ongoing refinements indicate that this annual report, our annual plans, and our Strategic Plan are living documents and an integral part of our operations.

In our continuous effort to improve our performance measurement program, we recently completed a two-year project to upgrade PMRS. We are taking advantage of web infrastructure to collect our performance data from the more than 70 organizational units that send data to PMRS from all over the country. We also are using newer, more robust, enterprise-level databases to store the data and extract reports, instead of the high-maintenance desktop databases previously used. This upgrade enables us to collect our performance data more consistently and more efficiently and allows us to store much more data for use in analyzing trends.

We have also implemented a program management system (PROMT) to help us control the cost and schedule for the Electronic Records Archives (ERA) program. We have expanded the use of PROMT throughout NARA to help us improve our capabilities for managing and tracking performance on other projects. PROMT integrates several commercial off-the-shelf program management tools in a Windows-based web environment to help us schedule and link project activities, assign resources, collect and report costs, calculate earned value, and analyze impacts and risks to the ERA program. PROMT incorporates an EIA-748 compliant tool that meets Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Government Accountability Office (GAO) requirements for calculating earned value.

## FY 2005 Performance by Strategic Goal

### *Strategic Goal 1: Records Management*

*Essential evidence is created, identified, appropriately scheduled, and managed for as long as needed.*

#### **Long-Range**

#### **Performance Targets**

1.1. By 2008, 95 percent of agencies view their records management program as a positive tool for asset and risk management.

1.2. By 2008, 95 percent of approved capital asset plans have approved records schedules by the time those systems begin creating records.

1.3. By 2008, 95 percent of customers are satisfied with NARA scheduling and appraisal services.

**FY 2005 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:** \$17,029,000; 148 FTE

#### 1.1 RECORDS MANAGEMENT REDESIGN

#### **FY 2005 Objectives**

- Deliver the results promised on 95 percent of targeted assistance partnership projects.
- Survey Federal agencies to establish baseline percentage of agencies that view their records management programs as a positive tool for asset and risk management.
- Increase by 10 percent the number of records management training participants who are taking a NARA records management course for the first time.
- Conduct a records management study.

#### **Results**

- We delivered the results promised on 100 percent of targeted assistance partnership projects.
- We increased the number of partnership projects established with Federal agencies from 361 to 372.
- We trained 3,366 Federal agency staff in records management and electronic records management.

*"The class was excellent, as were the instructors."*

- ✓ We conducted a records management study of the headquarters office of the U.S. Air Force.

*Discussion* We completed the first full year of our new records management training program, redesigned to address new trends in records management and the ongoing revolution in information technology so that agency records professionals can play an important role in process design, IT capital planning, and information and knowledge management in their agencies. With a Records Management Training Officer now part of our NARA-wide records management team, we will continue to apply adult education concepts and explore alternative delivery approaches in our training efforts.

We provided records management training to 3,366 Federal agency staff across the country this year, a 19-percent decrease from last year. The number we train each year fluctuates, depending on availability of staff to perform training and the number of Federal agency staff available to attend training. While our overall number of trainees was lower this year, 1,069 participants, 32 percent of our total, were taking a course for the first time. The increase in first-time participants is due in large part to our new, improved classes and our new records management certification program.

During the first year of our new certification program, 47 individuals successfully completed training in Federal records management and were professionally certified. The certification program is designed to raise awareness and improve effectiveness of Federal records management, increase the level of professionalism of those managing Federal records, give Federal records professionals a set of benchmarks to gauge their professional development, and give NARA the ability to better assess the effectiveness of its training program. Participants who successfully pass a series of examinations receive NARA's Certificate of Federal Records Management Training, signed by the Archivist of the United States.

We completed a study of records management practices at the headquarters of the U.S. Air Force. This first study, and others to follow, will help us identify and analyze best practices and develop Government-wide recommendations and guidance.

Targeted assistance projects are established between NARA and Federal agencies to solve specific records management problems. We established 11 new projects with Federal agencies this year. Since the program began in 1999, we have established 372 projects, completed 279 projects, and assisted 107 Federal agencies and field offices.

An example of the kind of work addressed in our targeted assistance projects was the Wildland Fire Records Project, an interagency partnership project with the Department of Agriculture Forest Service, the Department of Interior Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management, the Department of Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Department of Interior National Park Service. The project developed records management tools to control and preserve both paper and electronic wildland fire records during a fire incident and afterwards. These tools include approved records disposition schedules that cover multiple agencies, file classification schemes, briefings, and pilot training. Briefings and training were presented to more than 500 personnel from the five Federal agencies, as well as tribal organizations and state and local agencies. These standards and tools will allow the agencies to support fire operations more effectively and protect rights and interests of stakeholders. Just as important,

they will allow fire agencies to permanently preserve records supporting scientific and historical research, implementation of National Fire Policy, and planning under the National Environmental Policy Act.

We intended to conduct a survey asking Federal staff how they view the role of their agency management programs during FY 2005 and are continuing to investigate cost-effective means for doing so.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for annual percent of targeted assistance partnership projects delivering the results promised</i>	—	75	85	90	95	95
Annual percent of targeted assistance partnership projects delivering the results promised	100	100	100	100	100	100
Annual number of targeted assistance partnership projects initiated	123	63	77	58	13	11
Annual number of targeted assistance partnership projects completed	37	58	76	67	26	13
Annual number of targeted assistance partnership projects completed, delivering the promised results	37	58	76	67	26	13
Cumulative number of targeted assistance partnership projects initiated with Federal agencies	156	213	290	348	361	372
Cumulative number of targeted assistance partnership projects completed with Federal agencies	39	97	173	240	266	279
<i>Performance target for percent increase in the number of records management training participants who are taking a NARA records management course for the first time</i>						10
Percent of records management training participants taking a NARA records management course for the first time.					11	32
Number of Federal agency staff receiving NARA training in records management and electronic records management	3,506	2,506	3,746	3,497	4,166	3,366
Number of records management training participants who are taking a NARA records management course for the first time	—	—	—	—	442	1,069
Number of records management training participants certified this year.	—	—	—	—	—	47

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* NARA's *Strategic Directions for Federal Records Management* (2003) established the strategies we are using to improve records management across the Government and achieve Goal 1. We have begun to implement these strategies through a unified NARA program to support Federal records management.

In FY 2006 and beyond, the NARA records management program will make more effective use of our resources through improved and expanded communications with stakeholders, records management guidance and training, and assistance to Federal

agencies. We are working to find ways to minimize routine records scheduling activities and to develop planning and evaluation tools and automated tools to support records management. We are exploring ways to provide agencies with modern records center services and to preserve permanent records, focusing on electronic records. We will also use our authority to inspect agency records and records management programs, to conduct studies, and to report to Congress on Federal recordkeeping.

We will develop a cost-effective approach to measure how Federal staff view their agency records management programs and plan on developing and issuing the survey in FY 2006.

We will use the results of this survey to help us determine what additional advocacy activities for Federal records management programs and training of Federal records managers are required. With our online training and a professional certification program now under way, we have seen an increase in Federal agency staff taking training for the first time. We expect this trend to continue. We also expect a steady increase in the number of people who seek professional certification.

A status of the initiatives we are undertaking is provided in the section of this report entitled "Status of NARA Records Management" on page 92. A report highlighting the progress of individual agencies in managing and preserving their records, entitled "Federal Records Management Evaluations," is available on page 96.

#### 1.2 SCHEDULES FOR CAPITAL ASSET PLANS

##### **FY 2005 Objectives**

- In coordination with OMB, develop a multi-pronged approach to embedding records management requirements into the capital planning and acquisition process.
- Conduct needs assessment of Government and IT industry for the development of select records management service components for the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA).
- Develop high-level requirements for candidate records management service components.
- Complete a cooperative records project for at least one FEA Business Reference Model (BRM) Subfunction.

##### **Results**

- ✓ We developed a set of high-level requirements for records management service components.
- ✓ We are participating in the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) electronic Official Personnel File (e-OPF) project.

*Discussion* We pursued a number of avenues for institutionalizing agency incorporation of records management requirements into IT system planning, including incorporating

certain requirements in the Federal Acquisitions Regulations (FAR) and establishing a Records Management (RM) Profile in the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA). We identified these approaches under the auspices of the Interagency Committee on Government Information (ICGI) and through the Electronic Records Policy Working Group (ERPWG), an interagency group chaired by NARA. We met with the General Services Administration (GSA) FAR Secretariat and determined that we need to develop comprehensive programmatic guidance for use as a reference in any revision to the FAR. To fulfill this requirement, we are working on a web-based Records Management Handbook that we will deploy using the online Electronic Records Management (ERM) Toolkit. The Toolkit, scheduled for a prototype deployment in FY 2006, will be a NARA-managed Internet portal that will share ERM tools Government-wide. This year we completed a draft of the RM Profile and have vetted the draft internally and externally through a number of organizations, including the Federal Records Council.

We continued supporting the President's e-Government initiatives through the ERM Initiative, providing practical recordkeeping guidance and tools to Federal agencies for managing electronic records. NARA is partnering on this initiative with the Department of Defense, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other agencies.

We are the lead agency for the ERM Initiative project to develop records management service components. To identify core records management requirements that could be supported by records management service components, we held a series of facilitated workshops with records management and enterprise information architecture stakeholders from 18 Federal agencies, NARA subject matter experts, and industry and academic experts. These collaborative sessions resulted in a set of records management activity names, an initial high-level set of functional requirements, and a prioritized list of component activities. These requirements serve as a baseline and starting point for the procurement and development of records management service components.

NARA is using the OMB's FEA Business Reference Model (BRM) to develop cooperative records management projects for agencies with common lines of business. Our goal with these projects is to produce common records schedules, standardized records management processes, and other common products. We are participating in OPM's e-OPF project to digitize Federal employee Official Personnel Files, a project that has significant records management implications. We have commented on OPM's Detailed Requirements Analysis for NARA/National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) e-OPF and on the e-OPF Process Guidance. We are working with OPM's e-OPF policy working group to address recordkeeping requirements required by NARA and have provided them with general transfer guidance. We provided OPM with links to the applicable imaging standards published by the Association for Information and Image Management (AIIM) and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) to ensure OPM contractors are scanning records in accordance with NARA requirements as well as industry-recognized quality conversion standards. We also began the re-appraisal of the OPF to determine the appropriate disposition recommendation. As the e-OPF project moves forward we will continue to develop relevant disposition and technical guidance.

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* The ERM Initiative will continue to promote the expansion of Government-wide electronic records management with additional guidance products. We will work with the Department of Defense to extend the DoD 5015.2-STD

and interoperability specifications. Future transitional products will be developed under the auspices of ICGI.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Number of Federal Enterprise Architecture Business Reference Model sub-functions	153	163
<i>Performance target for cumulative number of Federal Enterprise Architecture Business Reference Model sub-functions covered by cooperative records projects</i>	—	1
Cumulative number of Federal Enterprise Architecture Business Reference Model sub-functions covered by cooperative records projects	—	0

**1.3 SCHEDULING AND APPRAISAL SERVICES**

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Process records schedule items within a median time of 200 calendar days or less.
- Prototype automated workflow and collaboration tools to support the redesigned scheduling and appraisal process.
- Increase by 10 percent the number of Federal agencies that are satisfied with NARA scheduling and appraisal services.

**Results**

- We processed records schedule items within a median time of 372 calendar days.
- We prototyped automated workflow and collaboration tools to support the redesigned scheduling and appraisal process.
- We released to Federal Records Officers the results of our first customer satisfaction survey.

*Discussion* We continue working steadily on processing records schedules. Because this measure is affected by the age and item count of specific records schedules, performance tends to fluctuate and is not necessarily predictive of the effort involved in completing records schedules. A factor in our inability to meet this year's goal was the statistical impact of two schedules with substantial numbers of items that took significant amounts of time to approve. To some degree, our prioritization of work on other important records management initiatives under way this year, such as the new records management training curriculum and national records management projects, impacted our ability to process records schedules. This demand will likely continue until some of these initiatives are self-sustaining.

We worked to conclude a two-year Business Processing Reengineering effort of our records lifecycle business processes. Many of these redesigned processes will be built into the Electronic Records Archives (ERA). Using the new process models, we began to identify and further define key process business rules that need to be incorporated into the system to enable automation and support effective workflow. These business rules will be used to meet ERA build requirements, and work in support of the ERA Require-

ments Management Plan will continue into FY 2006. The achievement of the “to-be” model will take several years and will require the maturation of NARA’s enterprise architecture.

In FY 2005 the two competing ERA vendors, as part of the Systems Analysis and Design Phase, demonstrated their prototypes of the ERA system. These successful prototype demonstrations ensure that NARA will have a conceptual model to use for actual system implementation upon conclusion of this phase of development.

A 2004 survey we conducted established a baseline measurement of Federal agencies’ level of satisfaction with NARA’s scheduling and appraisal services. Over the long term, repeated surveys will demonstrate improvement in customer satisfaction with NARA’s redesigned scheduling and appraisal services. We conducted our initial survey in late FY 2004, then spent much of the past year analyzing and reporting the results of the survey. In response to the results of the survey, we reaffirmed our efforts to improve the timeliness of records schedule approvals and the utility of our scheduling guidance and announced that we will begin monthly schedules status reports to agencies to keep them informed about the progress of their records schedules throughout the approval process.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for median time for records schedule items completed (in calendar days)</i>	—	260	240	225	220	200
Median time for records schedule items completed (in calendar days)	283	237	470	155	253	372
Average age of schedule items at completion (in calendar days)	461	410	532	274	332	339
Number of schedule items completed	5,664	4,728	9,374	4,686	3,182	4,260
Cost per records schedule item completed	—	—	—	—	—	\$256
Number of records schedule items completed within 120 calendar days of submission to NARA	1,229	659	1,999	1,573	507	681
Percent of records schedule items completed within 120 calendar days of submission to NARA	22	14	21	34	16	15
Percent of Federal agencies that are satisfied with NARA scheduling and appraisal services	—	—	—	—	57	—

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We have set our FY 2006 target for closing out records schedules at a median time of 180 calendar days or less. This target reflects that only gradual change is possible now. However, with the implementation of new processes that we are addressing through the Lifecycle Business Process Reengineering and the deployment of the Electronic Records Archives, major improvements will be possible in the future.

We will repeat our customer survey in FY 2006 to measure the impact of our efforts to improve agencies’ level of satisfaction with our scheduling and appraisal services.



**Strategic Goal 2: Electronic Records**

*Electronic records are controlled, preserved, and made accessible as long as needed.*

**Long-Range  
Performance Targets**

- 2.1. By 2008, NARA's Federal Records Center Program accepts and services electronic records.
- 2.2. By 2008, 80 percent of scheduled archival electronic records are accessioned by NARA at the scheduled time.
- 2.3. By 2008, 80 percent of archival electronic records are managed at the appropriate level of service.
- 2.4. By 2008, the median time from the transfer of archival electronic records to NARA until they are available for access is 35 days or less.
- 2.5. By 2008, the per megabyte cost of managing archival electronic records through the Electronic Records Archives decreases each year.

**FY 2005 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:** \$53,196,000; 86 FTE

2.1 SERVICING ELECTRONIC RECORDS IN NARA RECORDS CENTERS

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Enhance remote servicing capability for electronic Official Military Personnel Files for the Army.
- Establish detailed requirements for the eventual migration of electronic Official Military Personnel Files to the Electronic Records Archives (ERA) system.
- Develop Record Center Program business model for electronic records.
- Complete pilot program to store backup and inactive copies of agency electronic media in selected records center locations.
- Complete a pilot assessment for converting agency records into digital formats on electronic record media.

- Develop concept of operations and functional requirements for a Records Center Program Operations System.
  - Award contract for building a Records Center Program Operations System.
- Results**
- ✓ We established detailed requirements for the eventual migration of electronic Official Military Personnel Files to ERA.
  - ✓ We developed a business model for electronic records for the Federal Records Center Program.
  - ✓ We developed a concept of operations and draft functional requirements for a Records Center Program Operations System.

*Discussion* Since the beginning of FY 2000, NARA's Federal Records Center Program (FRCP) has been fully reimbursable, which allows us to be more flexible in responding to agency records needs and requires us to meet those needs in a cost-effective and efficient way. Our ability to provide our records center customers with responsive services for electronic records is closely tied to our Electronic Records Archives program. Until ERA is ready and can provide online servicing, we will test the delivery of new offline services for electronic records, and we have developed a five-year action plan to pilot new services.

In cooperation with the Department of Defense Joint Requirements and Integration Office (JR&IO), we visited electronic OMPF operational sites of the Departments of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) of the Department of Homeland Security. Earlier this year JR&IO staff briefed members of our staff on the Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS). The military departments and the USCG completed OMPF load surveys, describing system functions, volumes, and migration time lines. We also obtained test and sample data from the system owners. As a result of these data collections and our interactions with the military departments and USCG, we produced detailed requirements for the eventual migration of electronic OMPFs.

In late FY 2004 we selected a contractor to conduct an industry market analysis and help a NARA team develop a competitive strategy for our FRCP to enter the electronic records services market. We hosted a customer focus group to validate customer wants and needs. We accepted the final draft of the business model and have begun the process to identify and analyze next steps for implementing the business plan's recommendations. We also evaluated the possibilities and advantages of the FRCP providing electronic records services to Federal agencies, including collaboration opportunities between the FRCP and other NARA lines of business.

We validated design, construction, and environmental requirements for facilities to receive and store physical media for temporary electronic records and are incorporating these requirements into our pilot assessments of the storage of electronic media. The pilot

in the Central Plains Region, Kansas City, MO, began on schedule. We finalized initial procedures for the transfer and receipt of electronic storage media and will test these procedures over the course of this pilot. Our pilot at the Washington National Records Center in Suitland, MD, is behind schedule in part because of the prior need to develop electronic media storage requirements and because we needed to ensure the financial stability of the FRCP before making a commitment of additional resources. We are now proceeding with the design work and site assessment for the Suitland location and are on track to implement this pilot in FY 2006.

We began two separate pilots to establish a basic capability to provide scanning and digital conversion services for Federal agencies. One, the Production Scanning pilot, is in a testing phase while the other pilot, SmartScan, a "scan-on-demand" service, has already moved from testing to a fee-for-service activity. We have received the preliminary pilot findings for the SmartScan pilot and we are reviewing and analyzing these findings.

Our Records Center Program Operations System (RCPOS) will be the major information resource to manage the FRCP and will help us work more effectively with our customers. We will use RCPOS to manage our records center holdings and track customer service transactions on those holdings. Our development of RCPOS is running slightly behind the aggressive schedule we set for this system. We have worked through most of the initial steps for development of RCPOS, but the need to revise some of the design documents led us to delay finalizing subsequent documents needed for system design. We were also unable to award the contract to build RCPOS this fiscal year.

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will use our business model for the FRCP for electronic records services to deliver cost-effective, valuable services to our agency customers. The knowledge and experience from our pilots will be used to refine our services and prices for next year.

We will award a contract to a certified document imaging architect (CDIA) to gather and analyze findings from the two document conversion pilots. The contractor will incorporate potential and emerging conversion requirements for NARA's customers and explore production scanning as a potential service and conversion component of ERA. We will use the final pilot findings from both the Production Scan and SmartScan pilots, in conjunction with the CDIA contract deliverables, to establish a menu of scanning and digital conversion options and associated fees.

We will complete our requirements and our analysis of alternatives and award the contract to build RCPOS in early FY 2006.

## 2.2 ACCESSIONING ELECTRONIC RECORDS

### **FY 2005 Objectives**

- Establish business rules and priorities for putting legacy records control schedules into an ERA repository, and develop a plan for doing the work.
- Pre-accession two transfers of electronic records.
- Continue to identify and schedule Federal agency systems that generate electronic records.

**Results**

- ✓ We analyzed alternative approaches to put legacy records control schedules into an ERA repository.
- ✓ We identified 245 electronic systems that generate electronic records that have not been scheduled.
- ✓ We discussed pre-accessioning with six agencies.

*Discussion* We used our Resource Allocation methodology and the OMB BRM to target our assistance to Federal agencies. Last year we completed, based on the OMB BRM, an analysis of business processes, subfunctions, and agency activities across the Government, based on the OMB BRM, that are the most significant to protect legal rights, document government accountability, and preserve records that document the national experience. Using these criteria, we identified 13 business lines and 23 business subfunctions where we perceived the records to be at highest risk. We used this analysis to target our records management assistance to helping agencies with those subfunctions schedule their critical electronic records systems. We identified 245 electronic records systems this year and have developed schedules for 80 of these systems.

We discussed pre-accessioning electronic records with six agencies this year. While we have approved a schedule that calls for the near-term physical transfer of electronic records, we have not yet been able to initiate the transfer with the agency. We expect that more agencies will consider pre-accessioning once we can point to concrete examples demonstrating the advantages of this initiative.

We investigated several alternative approaches to putting legacy records control schedules into an ERA repository. Due to the scope and complexity of the work, we have postponed developing a plan for doing the work until next year.

**Performance Data**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Number of electronic records accessioned in one of the new transfer formats (in logical data records)	--	—	—	100	29,840
Size of accessioning backlog (in millions of logical data records)	--	—	—	529	369
Number of electronic records transferred (in thousands of files)*	2.1	7.8	68.3	432.9	—
Number of electronic records transferred (in millions of logical data records)	--	--	--	533.6	85.3

\* Figures represent the number of files transferred to NARA. The number of electronic records transferred, in logical data records, which is the preferred unit of measure, was not available until the Accession Management Information System upgrade was completed in 2004.

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will continue to survey agencies to identify unscheduled electronic systems and, using our resource allocation model, will work with agencies to get those systems under approved records schedules. We do not anticipate that we will be able to address completely our significant backlog of archival electronic

records until ERA is available. Until then, we will make workflow improvements and minor enhancements to our system capabilities in an attempt to keep up.

2.3 MANAGING ELECTRONIC RECORDS

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Establish criteria for levels of service for archival electronic records.
- Identify and respond to results of online survey to improve customer usability of Access to Archival Databases (AAD) system.
- Add State Department cables and digital photographs to AAD.
- Improve AAD's customer satisfaction score to 65 on customer survey tool.
- Increase archival electronic holdings that are accessible online by 20 percent over prior year.
- Collect and preserve snapshots of Federal Government web sites at the end of the first Bush Presidential term.

**Results**

- We established criteria for levels of service for electronic records in our holdings.
- "The data files you have put online are absolutely fantastic."*  We added digital photographs to AAD from the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA).
- "I just found information about my being a POW in WWII. Thanks."*  We increased our archival electronic holdings that are accessible online by 20 percent.
- We completed the harvest of Federal Government web sites at the end of the first Bush Presidential term.

*Discussion* In FY 2004 we learned from an online survey of customer satisfaction and from independent experts that we needed to make significant revisions to the AAD user interface. We contracted with a web designer to help us implement many of the recommendations that came out of the reports. We completed a significant amount of the redesign and testing of the new site, but software issues prevented us from launching the redesigned AAD in FY 2005. We have resolved the software issues and will launch the redesigned AAD in the first quarter of FY 2006.

Among the more than 14 million logical data records added to AAD this year are digital photographs from FEMA. We had planned to add a collection of State Department

cables, but we decided to wait until the redesigned AAD is rolled out. The redesigned site will offer enhanced searching capability that will enhance access to these cables.

To document the presence of Federal agencies on the Internet at the time the Presidential administration ended in January 2005, we took “snapshots” of Federal Government web sites. We have activated *Webharvest.gov*, the new web site for Federal Agency public web sites “harvested” as they existed prior to January 20, 2005. Through this site we provide ongoing public access to these copied web sites and will help future researchers understand how today’s Federal Government used the Internet to provide services and share information with the public.

We prepared criteria for levels of service for electronic records in our holdings. These levels of service will ensure that we establish appropriate preservation and access plans for incoming electronic records based on the content, expected reference activities, and technical characteristics of those records. By having varying levels of service, we will ensure that we provide appropriate service for all electronic records in a cost-effective manner.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for percent increase in number of archival electronic holdings accessible online</i>	—	—	50	20
Percent increase in number of archival electronic holdings accessible online	—	—	51	20
Number of archival electronic holdings accessible online (cumulative logical data records in millions)	0	47	71	86
Number of archival electronic holdings (cumulative logical data records in millions)	3,714	4,743	5,629	8,108
Percent of electronic records available online	0	1	1.4	1.1
Number of online visits to AAD (in thousands of visits)	—	489	551	526

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will continue to add electronic holdings to AAD, and we will use the online customer satisfaction survey tool to evaluate the effectiveness of the redesigned AAD.

#### 2.4 PROCESSING ELECTRONIC RECORDS

##### **FY 2005 Objectives**

- ❑ Process transfers of archival electronic records within a median time of 250 calendar days or less.

##### **Results**

- ✓ We processed archival electronic records transfers within a median time of 413 calendar days.

*Discussion* Our processing time improved from last year due to the deployment of an upgraded Accession Management Information System, which supports the overall accessioning process. We further improved our processing time through the implementation of a device that can provide unattended evaluation of 20 digital linear tapes (DLTs) at a time. We also completed a technical study to develop efficient network design for scaling our current systems and identified the various software products needed to validate the conformance of new format types acceptable to NARA. Several small

hardware and software procurements will assist us in extending the use of our existing systems until deployment of ERA.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for median time to make archival electronic accessions available for access (in calendar days)</i>	—	—	—	250	250
Median time (in calendar days) for processing electronic records accessions from the time of transfer to NARA	—	—	450	736	413
Number of electronic records transferred (in thousands of files)*	2.1	6.8	68.3	432.9	—
Number of electronic records transferred (in millions of logical data records)	—	—	—	534	85.3
Cost per electronic record transferred	—	—	—	\$0.01	\$0.07

*\* Figures represent the number of files transferred to NARA. The number of electronic records transferred, in logical data records, which is the preferred unit of measure, was not available until the Accession Management Information System upgrade was completed in 2004.*

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We are working to implement the recommendations of a technical study to extend our network capacity, improve our Archival Preservation System (APS) software, and improve the mechanisms for electronic file transfer modes. Despite these steps, we expect significant challenges to our ability to keep up with the volume of archival electronic records transferred to NARA in the near future.

**2.5 COST OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS PRESERVATION**

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>FY 2005 Objectives</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Review system requirements with competing vendors.</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conduct System Design Review with competing vendors.</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete Systems Design and Analysis phase.</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Select development contractor for the ERA system.</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete ERA Domain Model.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Results</b>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> We conducted System Requirements Reviews and System Design Reviews for the competing vendors.</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> We have selected Lockheed Martin to develop the ERA system.</li> </ul>   |

*Discussion* Through the Electronic Records Archives (ERA), we are addressing the challenges that the Federal Government faces in economically and effectively managing,

preserving, and making available its electronic records at any time, and in any place, for as long as needed. Throughout FY 2005 we held a design competition to determine who will build ERA. We met frequently with the two competing vendors to exchange technical information and provide subject matter expertise. We responded in a timely fashion to their questions to facilitate their requirements-gathering and refinement. We produced a final Interface Requirements Document to assist the vendors with interface requirements, identified and analyzed Review Item Discrepancies for each contractor's System Requirements Specification (SyRS) and System Architecture and Design Document submissions, and conducted Systems Requirements Reviews for both contractors. We also analyzed the final SyRS to complete the requirements review for the Systems Analysis and Design phase of the design competition.

System Design Reviews for both contractors occurred in May. Our source selection evaluation teams (cost, technical, and management) prepared final contractor evaluation reports, and we awarded the development contract in September. Throughout the down-select process, we ensured there were comprehensive evaluations, fair competition, and an evaluation process with adequate rationale and justification.

To further assist us, we formed a high-level committee of recognized experts and leaders in their fields to advise and make recommendations to NARA on issues related to the development, implementation, and use of the ERA system. This Advisory Committee on the Electronic Records Archives will provide an ongoing structure for bringing together experts in computer science and information technology, archival science and records management, information science, law, history, genealogy, and education.

We continued our collaborative research efforts into issues related to the lifecycle management of electronic records that are beyond state-of-the-art information technology or state-of-the-science computer, information, or archival sciences. Our research and exploratory development activities were aligned with the work of the Subcommittee on Networking and Information Technology Research and Development program and the President's Management Council's vision of Government-wide electronic records management in support of e-Government. Specific direction to agencies encouraged research to enable preservation and utility of electronic information archives and creation of digital archives of core knowledge for research and learning, as well as being able to produce, collect, store, communicate, and share high amounts of electronic information. We continued to rely to a large extent on established R&D management capabilities in partner agencies.

We substantially completed the ERA Domain Model. This model will help our contractors better understand our requirements and ensure that the elements of ERA (the system architectures, designs, and workflows) remain consistent over the course of system development.

Overall, the number of logical data records in NARA custody increased by 44 percent over last year, an increase of more than 2 billion logical data records. It is important to recognize that all our performance today represents is the ability to take custody and copy these electronic records for preservation. The ability to preserve these records in a persistent format over time and to make these records readily accessible to the public is being addressed within the scope of the ERA program.



The cost per megabyte to manage our archival electronic holdings fell dramatically this year to \$0.72 per megabyte from last year's figure of \$4.77. This drop is the result of the large increase in the electronic holdings we have stabilized. The annual cost is divided by the cumulative total of electronic holdings, and as we have seen a dramatic increase in the electronic holdings we have stabilized (more than 2.4 billion logical data records in the past year alone) the cost per megabyte has dropped accordingly.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target of percent of NARA's electronic holdings stabilized in preparation for their transfer to the Electronic Records Archives</i>	40	60	65	99	80
Percent of NARA's electronic holdings are stabilized in preparation for their transfer to the Electronic Records Archives	97	98	97	93	99.7
Number of logical data records in NARA's custody (in millions)	2,345	3,714	4,725	5,629	8,108
Number of logical data records stabilized (in millions)	2,272	3,642	4,594	5,252	8,084
Percent of Presidential logical data records managed and stabilized	99	49	49	62	90
Number of Presidential logical data records (in millions)	2.2	35.3	35.3	35.3	35.3
Number of Presidential logical data records stabilized (in millions)	2.2	17.3	17.3	22.1	31.7
Per megabyte cost for stabilizing archival electronic records	—	—	\$4.50	\$4.77	\$0.72

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* Our challenge in FY 2006 is to effectively oversee the performance of the contractor working to develop the ERA system.

### **Strategic Goal 3: Access**

*Essential evidence is easy to access regardless of where it is or where users are for as long as needed.*

**Long-Range  
Performance Targets**

3.1. By 2007, access to records and services and customer satisfaction levels meet or exceed NARA's published standards.

3.2. By 2007, 70 percent of NARA services are available online.

3.3. By 2008, 80 percent of NARA archival holdings are described in an online catalog.

3.4. By 2007, Government-wide holdings of 25-year-old or older records are declassified, properly exempted, or appropriately referred under the provisions of Executive Order 12958, as amended, through a series of ISOO-led interagency efforts.

3.5. By 2007, NARA archival holdings of 25-year-old or older records are declassified, properly exempted, or appropriately referred under the provisions of Executive Order 12958, as amended.

3.6. By 2007, 10 percent of records of a two-term President or 15 percent of records for a one-term President are open and available for research at the end of the five-year post-Presidential period specified in the Presidential Records Act.

3.7. By 2007, 90 percent of all NHPRC-assisted projects produce results promised in grant applications approved by the Commission.

**FY 2005 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:** \$146,139,000; 2,344 FTE

3.1 CUSTOMER SERVICE

**FY 2005 Objectives**

We met or exceeded NARA's published standards for access to records and services, as noted below:

- 95 percent of written requests are answered within 10 working days;
- 90 percent of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests are completed within 20 working days;

- 95 percent of requests for military service separation records at the National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis are answered within 10 working days;
- 95 percent of items requested in our research rooms are furnished within one hour of request or of scheduled pull time;
- 99 percent of customers with appointments have records waiting at the appointed time;
- 95 percent of Federal agency records reference requests in Federal records centers are ready when promised to the customer;
- 99 percent of records center shipments to Federal agencies are the records they requested;
- 80 percent of archival fixed-fee reproduction orders through the Order Fulfillment and Accounting System (OFAS) are completed in 35 working days or less;
- 95 percent of education programs, workshops, and training courses meet attendees' expectations.

**Results**

*"You have proven that outstanding customer service is not a lost art at NARA."*

*"Thanks to your conscientious employees for their professionalism in handling inquiries for our veterans and their dependents."*

*"The information that your reference archivists have led me to has been of key importance in my research."*

*"Every request I have ever sent has been met expeditiously, and with more courtesy than one might expect these days."*

- ✓ We answered 96 percent of written requests within 10 working days.
- ✓ We completed 80 percent of all FOIA requests for Federal records within 20 working days.
- ✓ We answered 88 percent of military service separation records requests within 10 working days.
- ✓ We furnished 98 percent of requested items within one hour of request or of scheduled pull time.
- ✓ We furnished records at the appointed time for 99 percent of customers with appointments.
- ✓ We had ready 97 percent of Federal agency reference requests when promised to the customer.

- “Each year new issues take priority, but your staff always rises to the occasion.”*  
—Member of Congress
- ✓ Of the records we shipped to Federal agencies, 99.99 percent were the records agencies requested.
- ✓ We completed 98 percent of our archival fixed-fee reproduction orders through OFAS in 35 days or less.
- “Every speaker, every tour, every handout, every other attendee made my learning experience very challenging and satisfying.”*
- ✓ Our users rated 99 percent of our public education programs and workshops as meeting their expectations.

*Discussion* Once again we met or exceeded almost all of our customer service targets. Our customers received answers to their requests for military service separation records within 10 days 88 percent of the time, a significant increase from last year’s figure of 75 percent but below our goal for FY 2005. We continue to improve our performance and expect to reach our target of 95 percent in FY 2006.

While the timeliness of our responses to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests improved over last year, we failed to meet our target for completing 90 percent of FOIA requests for Federal records within 20 working days. A combination of factors has remained consistent over the past several years in contributing to this. FOIA requests for military records take considerably longer than the 20-day standard if the requests are for records that were lost in the 1973 fire at the National Personnel Records Center and the data must be reconstructed from other sources, or if the records have been borrowed by another agency. Also, the extent of time to respond to a FOIA can be lengthy if the records must be referred to another agency for declassification review before releasing the information, or if the records requested are particularly voluminous. Overall, the average age of completed FOIAs declined to 18 working days in FY 2005, a significant improvement from last year.

We keep our target for FOIA response to Federal records high because we believe we should aspire to the highest level of customer service whenever possible. And, for the majority of requests, we are able to meet or exceed our target. Sixty-seven percent of the more than 8,700 FOIAs for Federal records we completed were done in 10 days or less, half the time required by law.

We continued to make steady progress in a multiyear project to microfilm the records of the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands (Freedmen’s Bureau) from the Reconstruction era, which contain a great deal of information about the African American family experience across 15 states and the District of Columbia. The information is difficult to extract, the records are fragile, and have only been available in one NARA location. To date, we have distributed the microfilm of these records to our regional archives and microfilm rental program for 12 states (Florida, Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Delaware, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and South Carolina) and the District of Columbia, and we are on schedule to complete the project within the five-year time frame. And, with the help of a grant from the Peck Stacpoole Foundation and a partnership with Howard University’s Computer Science Department, we have launched an indexing project to provide online access to

Headquarters Marriage Certificate files, some of the most popular files in this series for genealogists.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for written requests answered within 10 working days</i>	80	80	85	85	90	95
Percent of written requests answered within 10 working days	92	93	93	94	95	96
<i>Performance target for Freedom of Information Act requests completed within 20 working days</i>	80	80	85	85	85	90
Percent of Freedom of Information Act requests for Federal records completed within 20 working days	27	27	76	61	65	80
Number of FOIAs processed	8,751	7,634	8,824	4,830	5,224	8,881
Annual cost to process FOIAs (in millions)	—	—	\$1.54	\$1.35	\$1.43	\$1.74
Annual per FOIA cost	—	—	\$175	\$265	\$273	\$196
<i>Performance target for requests for military service separation records at the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) in St. Louis answered within 10 working days</i>	—	—	—	—	70	95
Percent of requests for military service separation records at NPRC answered within 10 working days	—	7	40	37	75	88
Number of military service separation records (DD-214) requests received (in thousands)	—	297	361	390	372	350
Average price per request for military service separation records	—	—	—	\$29.70	\$29.70	\$29.70
<i>Performance target for requests for all military service records at NPRC answered within 10 working days</i>	—	25	30	35	—	—
Percent of requests for all military service records at NPRC answered within 10 working days	3	4	28	28	48	52
<i>Performance target for items requested in our research rooms furnished within one hour of request or scheduled pull time</i>	95	95	95	95	95	95
Percent of items requested in our research rooms furnished within one hour of request or scheduled pull time	89	93	94	96	98	98
Number of researchers visiting our research rooms (in thousands)	—	—	248.7	204.5	168.8	165.6
Number of items furnished in our research rooms (in thousands)	918	1,056	613	607	696	537
Number of items furnished on time in our research rooms (in thousands)	818	985	578	584	866	527
<i>Performance target for customers with appointments for whom records are waiting at the appointed time</i>	99	99	99	99	99	99
Percent of customers with appointments for whom records are waiting at the appointed time	99.4	99.7	99.8	99.9	99.3	99.4

**National Archives and Records Administration**  
**Performance and Accountability Report, FY 2005**

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for Federal agency reference requests in Federal records centers that are ready when promised to the customer</i>	90	90	90	90	90	95
Percent of Federal agency reference requests in Federal records centers that are ready when promised to the customer	79	93	92	94	96	97
<i>Performance target for records center shipments to Federal agencies are the records they requested</i>	—	99	99	99	99	99
Percent of records center shipments to Federal agencies are the records they requested	—	99.99	99.99	99.99	99.99	99.99
<i>Performance target for archival fixed-fee reproduction orders through OFAS are completed in 35 working days or less</i>	—	—	50	60	75	80
Percent of archival fixed-fee reproduction orders through OFAS are completed in 35 working days or less	—	—	88	99	99.9	97.2
Average per order cost to operate fixed-fee ordering	—	—	—	\$26.34	\$29.35	\$27.31
Average order completion time (days)	—	—	20	14	9	12
<i>Performance target for percent of education programs, workshops, and training courses meeting attendees' expectations</i>	90	90	95	95	95	95
Percent of education programs, workshops, and training courses meeting attendees' expectations	95	97	96	95	99	99
Number of program attendees	6,971	6,291	8,447	7,601	8,125	9,248

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* For customer service targets that we currently meet, we expect to continue that trend and have increased our targets for several. For those that we have not met, we expect to see steady improvements in FY 2006.

**3.2 ONLINE SERVICES**

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Ensure 50 percent of NARA services are available online.
- Align our online acquisition capabilities with the Integrated Acquisition Environment e-Government Initiative.

**Results**

*"The [redesigned Archives.gov] site is beautiful and rich in content."*

- We made 50 percent of our services available online.

*"In the past month I've ordered six pension application and land entry files and received them all within two weeks. I was amazed!"*

- We expanded *Order Online!* to allow Internet users to search for and order copies of microform products.

*Discussion* We expanded the functional capability of *Order Online!* to allow customers to perform online searches for microfilm available for purchase, viewing, or renting and to order microform products. As a sign that our online ordering capability is meeting the needs of our customers, more than 50 percent of the fixed-fee orders we receive are online orders. The application has been available to users 97 percent of the time, and more than 32,000 users have accessed the site this year.

We continue to collect public feedback about *Archives.gov* and our other web sites through our American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) online surveys of our sites and major application interfaces such as our Archival Research Catalog (ARC) and Access to Archival Databases (AAD) systems. The results of these surveys helped guide the design of our web site, *Archives.gov*, to make it more helpful to our customers. In FY 2005 we redesigned *Archives.gov* to improve navigation of the site, a need indicated by our web customer satisfaction survey results. In recognition of our efforts we won “Best Practices, Best Web Design in 2005,” a peer award voted by Federal web managers throughout Government service.

Also in FY 2005 we launched web features about “The Declaration of Independence: Our National Treasure” and the Electoral College. Both features are designed to educate the public about archives and NARA’s services. The Electoral College feature, launched in October 2004, addressed interest in the 2004 Presidential election, while the “National Treasure” materials encouraged further interest from visitors intrigued by the concepts of hidden messages and exploration of records as presented in the motion picture *National Treasure*. We published online the 9/11 Commission’s recently released “Staff Monograph on the Four Flights and Civil Aviation Security” as an adjunct to the frozen public access version of the Commission’s web site, which is now a Federal record managed by NARA. We also provided online digital copies of documents from our holdings relating to Supreme Court nominee John Roberts. The timely publication of these documents online ensured the widest possible public access to these materials.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Online visits to NARA’s web sites (in thousands)*	10,096	16,106	19,538	30,943	30,428	21,377
Cost to provide NARA services online per visit	—	—	—	\$0.16	\$0.13	\$0.17
<i>Performance target for percent of NARA services available online</i>	—	—	20	30	40	50
Percent of NARA services available online	—	24	25	30	40	50
Number of NARA services online	—	29	30	36	48	59

*\*At the start of the year we upgraded the tool (WebTrends) we use to collect our online visit statistics. The new version of this product does not count agents that index our site constantly (agents from search engines, for instance). As a result, while our overall online visit count is lower this year, we have a total that better reflects the number of actual visits to our sites.*

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We are working on online services to be deployed in FY 2006 to ensure that we will meet our target of 60 percent of our online services online. By the end of FY 2006, customers will be able to submit an online request for copies of documents from bankruptcy, civil, criminal, and Court of Appeals case files.

3.3 ONLINE CATALOG

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- ☑ Describe 40 percent of NARA traditional holdings in the Archival Research Catalog.
- ☑ Describe 40 percent of NARA artifact holdings in the Archival Research Catalog.
- ☑ Describe 10 percent of NARA electronic holdings in the Archival Research Catalog.

**Results**

*“Great service, very public oriented, and of course that wonderful collection. Good work!”*

*“All that information at my fingertips. I will be visiting and exploring this site often in the future.”*

- ✓ We described 42 percent of NARA traditional holdings in the Archival Research Catalog (ARC).
- ✓ We described 43 percent of NARA artifact holdings in the ARC.
- ✓ We described 31 percent of NARA electronic holdings in ARC.
- ✓ We have implemented ARC in all archival units nationwide.

*Discussion* We continued our agency-wide description work this year and now have more than 233,000 artifacts, 2.5 billion logical data records, and over 1.3 million cubic feet of traditional holdings described and searchable at the series or collection level in ARC via the Internet. The Carter Library became the first archival unit in our agency to describe 100 percent of its holdings in ARC.

**Performance Data**

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Percent of nationwide archival holdings described in an online catalog	13.9	13.2	—	—	—	—
Cubic feet of archival holdings (in thousands)	2,768	2,915	—	—	—	—
Cubic feet of archival holdings described in an online catalog	386	386	—	—	—	—
<i>Performance target for traditional holdings in an online catalog</i>	—	—	20	25	30	40
Percent of traditional holdings in an online catalog	—	—	19	20	33	42
Number of traditional holdings described in an online catalog (thousands of cubic feet)	—	—	550	602	1,033	1,344
Number of traditional holdings in NARA (thousands of cubic feet)	—	—	2,890	3,025	3,157	3,167
<i>Performance target for artifact holdings in an online catalog</i>	—	—	20	25	30	40
Percent of artifact holdings in an online catalog	—	—	19	17	40	43
Number of artifact holdings described in an online catalog (thousands of items)	—	—	90	90	215	233



<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Number of artifact holdings in NARA (thousands of items)	—	—	470	528	540	544
<i>Performance target for electronic holdings in an online catalog</i>	—	—	0	0	5	10
Percent of electronic holdings in an online catalog	—	—	0.02	0.02	10	31
Number of electronic holdings described in an online catalog (millions of logical data records)	—	—	1	1	536	2,539
Number of electronic holdings in NARA (millions of logical data records)	—	—	3,714	4,743	5,629	8,108
Number of ARC users (in thousands of user hits*)	—	—	713	1,884	—	—
Number of ARC users (in thousands of visits*)	—	—	—	—	158	286

*\* Online visits: One person using our web site is counted as one "visit." It is a count of the number of visitors to our web site, and is similar to counting the number of people who walk through our front door. In contrast, it does not count "hits," which refers to the number of files used to show the user a web page. A visit in which a user accessed a web page comprising 35 files would count as one visit and 35 hits. Counting visits is a more accurate way of showing how much use our web site is getting than counting hits.*

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We anticipate meeting our targets set for 2006. However, much of the description work occurring now is for larger series and collections that represent considerably more holdings and get more of our holdings into ARC quickly. As we move forward to other smaller records series or collections, representing smaller numbers of holdings, but more description work, our performance may diminish simply because the methodology for measuring our performance does not recognize the size of a series or collection. We must use this methodology, however, because until archival holdings are processed, we do not know how many series are contained in the materials.

**3.4 GOVERNMENT-WIDE DECLASSIFICATION**

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Ensure that 25 percent of the FY 2004 baseline of Government-wide holdings of classified records 25 years old or older are declassified, properly exempted, or appropriately referred.

**Results**

- ✓ We sampled eight agencies with the largest volume of records to be reviewed to assess the level of effort expended in FY 2005.
- ✓ We analyzed agency comments and updated a draft referral standard to assist agencies in meeting the automatic declassification deadline.

*Discussion* In FY 2004 we tasked 75 agencies with developing declassification plans for how they planned to meet the requirements of Executive Order 12958, as amended. Of those tasked, 26 agencies did not need to develop plans because they had no records

subject to automatic declassification. To date, we have confirmed that 22 of the 48 agencies that have responsive records will make or are likely to make the December 31, 2006, deadline. We are engaged in a cooperative effort with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the nine Unified Combatant Commands to ensure that they meet the deadline. We are working with the White House to ensure that the White House offices that produce Federal records not covered by the Presidential library system have declassification programs. We are also reviewing the updated declassification plans for eight agencies.

As one solution to meeting the December 31, 2006, deadline for automatic declassification, the Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO) is working on standardizing the referral process for records that need to be addressed by agencies with joint equities. We have encouraged the development of a framework for a Government-wide declassification training program and information sharing of declassification guidance through the External Referral Working Group (ERWG), an interagency working group within which the declassification community is well represented.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005*</b>
Number of pages declassified Government-wide (in millions of pages)	75.0	100.1	44.4	43.1	28.4	TBD
Per page cost of Government-wide declassification	\$3.08	\$2.32	\$2.55	\$1.25	\$1.70	TBD
Total cost of declassification Government-wide (in millions of dollars)	\$230.9	\$231.9	\$112.96	\$53.8	\$48.3	TBD

\*FY 2005 data will be collected from Federal agencies and reported to the President in 2006.

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* Meeting the targets set forth in E.O. 12958, as amended, will be very challenging. Security concerns related to the war on terrorism may divert resources away from declassification efforts Government-wide or lead to the withholding of additional records. Agencies' cooperation is essential in identifying the records subject to automatic declassification, impediments to meeting the new deadline, and solutions to these impediments.

### 3.5 NARA DECLASSIFICATION

#### **FY 2005 Objectives**

- Ensure that 50 percent of the FY 2004 baseline of NARA archival holdings of classified records 25 years old or older are declassified, properly exempted, or appropriately referred.
- Scan 300,000 pages of Presidential archival materials eligible for declassification review as part of the Remote Archives Capture project.

#### **Results**

- We released 527,210 pages of declassified Federal records and 77,553 pages of declassified Presidential records.
- We scanned 562,502 pages of Presidential materials eligible for declassification review as part of the Remote Archives Capture project.

*Discussion* FY 2005 was the first year of operation of the Interagency Referral Center (IRC), our system designed to support the process of agency review of referred materials in Federal records that are part of the National Archives. By handling referrals through the IRC, NARA retains physical and intellectual control of the records. The IRC gives access to agency reviewers and allows us to prioritize the order in which referrals are processed so we can deal with records of high research interest in a timely manner. The IRC supports a standard method for recording agency decisions, ensuring that when NARA staff process the records for release or exemption, the agency determination will be clearly understood and NARA will avoid inadvertent releases of still sensitive information.

Our work to coordinate and support IRC activity is now the major task in our declassification program. In our first year of operation we indexed approximately 1.5 million pages for referral. We improved system performance and are gaining experience in preparing unprocessed records for the IRC. We saw a steady improvement in the amount of material processed through the IRC over the course of the year and expect continued improvement in FY 2006.

For classified materials in the Presidential library system for which we have no delegated declassification authority, we continue to work in partnership with the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to prepare and scan classified materials for distribution to agencies with equities in the documents.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Backlog of Federal records requiring declassification at start of year (in thousands)	52,864	25,029	20,980	18,980	25,581	25,020
<i>Performance target for annual percent of Federal records NARA reviewed that are more than 25 years old for which NARA has declassification authority</i>	50	50	85	90	—	50
Annual percent of Federal records NARA reviewed that are more than 25 years old for which NARA has declassification authority	15	9	12	7	2	2
Backlog of Presidential materials requiring declassification at start of year (in thousands)	1,978	1,562	1,240	960	806	668
<i>Performance target for annual percent of Presidential records NARA reviewed that are more than 25 years old for which NARA has declassification authority</i>	25	25	85	90	—	50
Annual percent of Presidential records NARA reviewed that are more than 25 years old for which NARA has declassification authority	21	21	23	16	17	67
Annual number of Federal pages reviewed (in thousands)	8,052	2,129	2,490	1,257	547	605
Annual number of Federal pages declassified (in thousands)	3,697	807	402	340	116	35
Annual number of Federal pages released (in thousands)	7,678	1,788	2,184	1,092	994	527
Annual number of Presidential pages reviewed (in thousands)	416	322	280	154	138	449

**National Archives and Records Administration**  
 Performance and Accountability Report, FY 2005

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Annual number of Presidential pages declassified (in thousands)	291	219	119	71	94	94
Annual number of Presidential pages released (in thousands)	285	207	182	71	94	78
<i>Performance target for annual number of Presidential pages scanned (in thousands)</i>	--	300	300	600	300	300
Annual number of Presidential pages scanned (in thousands)	160	322	332	470	500	563
Cost per page declassified (Federal and Presidential)	--	--	--	\$23.44	\$24.29	TBD

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* Meeting the targets of Executive Order 12958, as amended, will be a significant challenge.

**3.6 PRESIDENTIAL RECORDS**

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Process an additional 2 percent of Clinton Presidential and Vice Presidential records for opening on January 20, 2006.

**Results**

- We processed an additional 1 percent of Clinton Presidential and Vice Presidential records for opening on January 20, 2006.

*Discussion* Progress continued to be slow in processing additional records this year. We spent the first quarter of FY 2005 preparing for the dedication of the William J. Clinton Library and Museum, as the archival staff there participated in activities associated with the dedication and engaged in public outreach following the November dedication of the library. Our archival staff at Clinton worked until the opening of the exhibit locating documents and other items for the exhibit, assisting in the production of the museum orientation film, reboxing documents for display in the museum exhibit, and installing the museum exhibits. This work was essential in ensuring that the initial exhibits in the museum are based on the primary source material housed in the library. As we assessed our textual collections, we updated our holdings count to reflect more accurately the holdings in our legal custody. With the exhibit now open, we have devoted more time to the review of records and, while we have fallen short of this year's goal, have made substantial progress in preparing material for release to the public on January 20, 2006.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for cumulative percent of Clinton Presidential and Vice Presidential traditional records processed for opening January 20, 2006</i>	1	3	3	5	5
Cumulative percent of Clinton Presidential and Vice Presidential traditional records processed for opening January 20, 2006	1	1	1	2	3
Cumulative cubic feet of Clinton Presidential and Vice Presidential traditional records	28,925	28,925	37,686	39,049	34,818
Cumulative cubic feet of Clinton Presidential and Vice Presidential traditional records processed for opening	291	291	291	752	944

<i>Performance target for cumulative percent of Clinton Presidential and Vice Presidential electronic records processed for opening January 20, 2006</i>	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Performance target for cumulative percent of Clinton Presidential and Vice Presidential artifacts processed for opening January 20, 2006</i>	0	0	0	0	0

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will continue to devote our resources to archival processing in FY 2006.

**3.7 NHPRC GRANTS**

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- ❑ 87 percent of all NHPRC-assisted projects produce results promised in grant applications approved by the Commission.

**Results**

*“The support that the NHPRC has provided us has been invaluable as we begin to create a municipal archive here in Somerville.”*

- ✓ Of the NHPRC-assisted projects completed, 85 percent produced the results promised in their grant applications.
- ✓ We have made our application packages available for online applications on the *Grants.gov* web site.

*Discussion* We fell just short of meeting our target for successful completion of our grant projects. This year we completed 107 projects, 91 of which produced the results promised in their grant applications. Roughly 40 percent of the projects were publications efforts, and approximately 60 percent were records projects. Of the 15 projects that did not produce the promised results, three of the records projects actually never got under way and, therefore, we expended no grant funding in those cases. From the work accomplished this year, more than 9,400 cubic feet of records were reported by grantees to be preserved and made accessible, and six documentary editions were published. We continued posting NHPRC grant opportunities on the Government-wide *Grants.gov* web site and made grant application forms available on our *Archives.gov* web site. We simplified the process for our grantees by accepting alternate means, such as fax, for the transmission of interim reports and requests. We have also streamlined our grant guidelines and have made our application packages available for online applications using the *Grants.gov* portal. We have also completed a business process engineering study and pursued several internal process improvements.

For a more list of NHPRC-funded grants products, visit [www.archives.gov/nhprc/products/](http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/products/).

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for percent of NHPRC grant-funded projects produced results promised in grant applications</i>	82	84	84	85	86	87
Percent of NHPRC grant-funded projects that produced results promised in grant applications	94	91	79	86	88	85
Number of NHPRC-assisted projects completed	67	115	104	72	96	107
Number of NHPRC-assisted projects that produced the results promised	63	105	82	62	84	91

**National Archives and Records Administration**  
 Performance and Accountability Report, FY 2005

---

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Number of traditional records preserved and made accessible through our grants projects (in cubic feet)	—	—	—	—	1,803	9,434
Number of electronic records preserved and made accessible through our grants projects (in logical data records)	—	—	—	—	0	0
Number of documentary editions published through our grants project (in volumes)	—	—	—	—	14	6
Percent of NARA's grants announced on <i>Grants.gov</i>	—	--	—	—	100	100

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We anticipate meeting our target for FY 2006. However, it is important to note that the Commission and its staff are committed to projects that will stretch the archival, documentary editing, and electronic records communities, encouraging them to take risks. While this will produce many more useful products, it increases the possibility of projects being rated unsuccessful in meeting their criteria.

As we work on internal process improvements, we are poised to invest in a grants management system that uses a shared services model. We will implement the first phase of this system in FY 2006.

**Strategic Goal 4: Space and Preservation**

*All records are preserved in an appropriate environment for use as long as needed.*

**Long-Range  
Performance Targets**

4.1. By 2009, 100 percent of NARA's archival holdings are in appropriate space.

4.2. By 2009, 100 percent of NARA records centers comply with the October 2009 regulatory storage standards.

4.3. By 2007, 50 percent of NARA's at-risk archival holdings are appropriately treated or housed so as to retard further deterioration.

**FY 2005 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:** \$63,981,000; 151 FTE

4.1 ARCHIVAL HOLDINGS IN APPROPRIATE SPACE

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Complete all renovations at the National Archives Building.
- Open Clinton Presidential Library.
- Complete 50-percent concept design of Roosevelt Library renovation.
- Complete 50-percent concept design of Kennedy Library renovation and addition.
- Complete construction of the Southeast Regional Archives.
- Accept final design of Pacific Alaska Regional Archives and Records Center.
- Complete facility specifications for new military personnel records center in St. Louis.
- Complete facility specifications and lease agreement for the Southwest Regional Archives.

**Results**

- ✓ We substantially completed renovation work in the National Archives Building.
- ✓ We received the 15-percent concept drawings for the Roosevelt Library renovation.
- ✓ We received the 50-percent concept drawings for the Kennedy Library renovation.

- ✓ We completed site preparation for the Pacific Alaska Regional Archives and Records Center.
- ✓ We defined the program requirements for a new National Personnel Records Center facility.
- ✓ We received a revised concept design for the Southwest Regional Archives.

*Discussion* We finished all substantial work in the renovation of the National Archives Building, our major initiative in this area. We completed all work in the base renovation contract, with only work to replace electrical systems in the archival storage areas and some refinishing on the Rotunda display cases left to complete next year.

We dedicated the Clinton Presidential Library and Museum. All archival and artifact holdings from the Clinton administration are now housed in this state-of-the-art facility that meets our storage standards. The library's exhibit is now open to visitors, and the library has its research room open with a small amount material available for research.

We also opened a new archival facility for the Southeast Region in Morrow, GA. This facility consolidates operations that were previously housed in three separate facilities in Georgia and Alabama. The facility features ample storage space, meeting our environmental storage standards and accessible facilities for our researchers and public program attendees. The move to this new facility placed over 90,000 cubic feet of regional archival records under appropriate space and environmental standards. With the relocation of these records, NARA's regional archives system went from having 9 percent of its holdings under appropriate space and environmental standards to more than 18 percent.

We defined the program requirements for a combined military and civilian personnel records center and prepared a draft plan and cost estimate for moving to a new facility. While we did not complete the final design of the Pacific Alaska Regional Archives and Records Center, we did complete the site preparation for the facility.

The Roosevelt Library renovation design moved slower than expected but should not have an adverse impact on the overall renovation. We received the 50-percent concept drawings for the renovation of the Kennedy Library and are on schedule for the remainder of this project.

Our cost per cubic foot to store our archival holdings this year was \$6.48, an increase over last year's per cubic foot cost of \$6.11. As we work to lower our storage costs while bringing more facilities into compliance with our archival storage standards, we face a number of factors that work against that goal, including rising rent costs, higher utility rates, and the costs associated with maintaining security at our facilities. We are following a strategy of leasing storage facilities separate from our public use facilities. We can realize savings by locating our public use facilities in areas where they reach the greatest number of possible users while leasing facilities designed for long-term storage in lower-cost areas.



<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Percent of archival traditional holdings in appropriate space	—	52	53
Cubic feet of archival traditional holdings (in thousands)	3,025	3,100	3,166
Percent of artifact holdings in appropriate space	—	42	42
Number of artifact holdings (in thousands)	528	540	543
Percent of logical data record holdings in appropriate space	—	100	100
Number of logical data record holdings (in millions)	4,743	5,629	8,108
Cost of archival storage space per cubic feet of traditional holdings stored	—	\$6.11	\$6.48

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We expect to continue to stay within budget and schedule targets for our facility projects.

4.2 NARA RECORDS CENTER HOLDINGS IN APPROPRIATE SPACE

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Close Birmingham, AL, Annex.
- Close Denver, CO, Annex.
- Close Fort Worth Building 5 Annex.
- Complete lease agreement to construct a records center facility in Fort Worth, TX.
- In coordination with GSA, implement an Energy Saving Operating Plan for the Washington National Records Center.

**Results**

- We developed a facility repair plan to bring NARA records centers into compliance with regulatory storage standards by the 2009 deadline.

*Discussion* The primary thrust over the next several years must be to upgrade our records center facilities to meet 2009 regulatory storage standards or relocate to new facilities that are built to meet those standards. These standards are in place to ensure that Federal records are protected whether they are stored by NARA, another Federal agency, or the private sector. We developed a facility repair plan to bring our records centers into compliance with regulatory storage standards. This plan includes the facility assessments that will be conducted to certify that space meets required storage standards. We implemented the Energy Saving Operating Plan for the Washington National Records Center by completing the retrofit of the chiller plant and lighting in the facility.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Percent of NARA records center buildings certified as complying with the October 2009 regulatory storage standards	—	—	—	—	0	9
Volume of records center holdings (cubic feet in millions)	21.7	22.6	23.1	23.2	24.1	24.5
Storage price per cubic foot for records center holdings	\$1.96	\$1.96	\$2.00	\$2.10	\$2.16	\$2.16

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We expect to continue to stay within budget and schedule targets for our facility projects. We will continue with certification of NARA records center buildings as we bring them into compliance with October 2009 regulatory storage standards.

**4.3 PRESERVATION OF AT-RISK HOLDINGS**

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Appropriately treat or house 43 percent of NARA's at-risk archival holdings so as to retard further deterioration.
- Inventory and rehouse 8 percent of Official Military Personnel Files (OMPFs).

**Results**

- We inventoried and rehoused 5 percent of OMPFs.

*Discussion* We assess our holdings regularly to identify those records that have a high risk for deterioration, and then we preserve those records by providing storage that retards deterioration or by treating, duplicating, or reformatting records to preserve them for as long as they are needed. In FY 2005 we conducted major surveys to determine the overall condition of our holdings and entered additional records into our risk databases. We continued our positive trend of the past several years and exceeded our target this year by treating or housing 47 percent of NARA's at-risk archival holdings.

As a result of an internal review of our at-risk preservation metric, we found that we need better consistency in what is deemed at-risk so that we can better track our progress in addressing the records of highest concern. We also determined that, to get a better picture of our overall preservation challenges, we need to track those medium and low-risk records that are getting treatment. We will develop new measures and targets during FY 2006 that will better indicate where resources should be applied and how effectively we are working.

While we failed to meet our goal of 8 percent of OMPFs inventoried and rehoused by the end of the year, we did get all the physical space, information technology resources, and staff in place for this project. We were able to complete 5 percent of the OMPFs and anticipate meeting the future goals for this project.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for percent of cumulative backlog ever treated</i>	—	30	32	36	40	43
Percent of cumulative backlog ever treated	25	28	32	35	41	47
Start-of-year backlog volume of at-risk archival holdings (thousands of cubic feet)	156	197	174	188	180	174
Volume of at-risk archival holdings that received conservation treatment this year (thousands of cubic feet)	35	26	11	17	18	29
Cumulative volume of at-risk archival holdings in cold storage (thousands of cubic feet)	—	63	67	74	80	86
Percent of start-of-year remaining backlog treated this year	22	16	7	9	10	17
<i>Performance target for cumulative percent of OMPFs inventoried and rehoused.</i>	—	—	—	—	—	8
Cumulative percent of OMPFs inventoried and rehoused.	—	—	—	—	—	5

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* Due to the volume and overall poor condition of the first accession of OMPFs, we will count the preservation of the OMPFs separately from the backlog of at-risk holdings waiting for treatment.

Significant increases in the cumulative backlog resulting from an assessment we conducted in FY 2005 may result in our inability to meet our FY 2006 target.

### **Strategic Goal 5: Infrastructure**

*NARA strategically manages and aligns staff, technology, and processes to achieve our mission.*

**Long-Range  
Performance Targets**

- 5.1. By 2008, the average time a leadership position remains unfilled is 30 days or less.
- 5.2. By 2007, the percentages of NARA employees in underrepresented groups match their respective availability levels in the Civilian Labor Force.
- 5.3. By 2007, NARA accepts 100 percent of the validated legal documents submitted electronically for publication in the *Federal Register*.
- 5.4. By 2008, all public network applications are available 99.9 percent of the time.

**FY 2005 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:** \$34,274,000; 123 FTE

5.1 RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Expand management trainee program to four additional NARA records centers.
- Fill leadership positions in an average time of 80 days or less.
- Complete pilot course on interviewer skills and techniques.
- Revise system for tracking and monitoring the timeliness of recruitment actions.
- Revise supervisors' performance plans to establish accountability for timely recruiting and selection.
- Maintain 95 percent of staff development plans linked to strategic outcomes.
- Maintain 95 percent of employee performance plans linked to strategic outcomes.

**Results**

- We expanded the management trainee program to four additional NARA records centers.

- ✓ We filled leadership positions in an average time of 83 days.
- ✓ We completed a pilot course on interviewer skills and techniques and posted the final training products on our web site.
- ✓ We linked 92 percent of employee performance plans to strategic outcomes.
- ✓ We linked 78 percent of staff development plans to strategic outcomes.

*Discussion* We continue to pursue a variety of tactics to help us prepare our workforce for the challenges ahead. We produced a report on our recruitment challenges and opportunities and have completed a plan for implementing changes in our recruiting process. We implemented a revised system to track and monitor the timeliness of our recruitment actions. We missed our target of 80 days to fill leadership positions, but our performance has improved from last year. We issued instructions to our office heads to include in the critical elements of supervisors' performance plans the supervisor responsibility to conduct interviews and make employment selections on a timely basis.

We expanded our program to develop the next generation of records center managers throughout NARA's Federal Records Center Program to four additional records centers. The program addresses the critical issues of retention of high-performing employees, succession planning as managers leave, and the need to foster a formal management development program in the records centers. The three-year program for selected interns provides them with training, increasingly complex work assignments in a variety of records center positions, a rotation through other NARA operations, and assignment to special projects. Throughout this program, the interns work closely with other NARA professionals, who serve as mentors, as well as with each other on collaborative projects.

In FY 2005 we developed content for an *Interviewer Skills Guide* and conducted a pilot session of an "Interviewer Skills Workshop" with a group of NARA managers. These training products, designed for managers who conduct applicant interviews, prepare managers to conduct effective interviews and thereby increase the quality of selections.

We have fallen short on our targets, but the vast majority of our staff had performance plans (92 percent) and staff development plans (78 percent) linked to NARA's Strategic Plan. We performed at or better than our performance level last year, and we will continue to stress the importance of these activities as we work to make these linkages a part of all our employees' performance and development plans. While we did not meet the targets associated with these actions, the process of creating staff development plans continues to provide opportunities for employee development that did not exist before our program began. Many employees choose to enhance their current assignments through a variety of job-shadowing, cross-training, and classroom training.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for average time (in calendar days) to fill a leadership position.</i>					80
Average time (in calendar days) to fill a leadership position	—	—	—	90	83
<i>Performance target for percent of staff having performance plans that link to strategic outcomes</i>	50	95	95	95	95
Percent of staff having performance plans that link to strategic outcomes	48	80	93	91	92
Number of NARA staff having performance plans that link to strategic outcomes	1,439	2,497	2,884	2,826	2,843
<i>Performance target for percent of permanent staff having staff development plans that link to strategic outcomes</i>	—	50	95	95	95
Percent of permanent staff having staff development plans that link to strategic outcomes	—	1	91	52	78
Number of NARA staff having staff development plans that link to strategic outcomes	—	7	2,435	1,401	2,073
Number of NARA permanent staff	2,710	2,733	2,682	2,704	2,671

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We anticipate that we will meet our FY 2006 targets and expect to see continued progress toward our long-range target of filling leadership positions in an average of 30 days.

#### 5.2 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

##### **FY 2005 Objectives**

- Ensure the percentages of NARA employees in underrepresented groups match 80 percent of their respective availability levels in the Civilian Labor Force.
- Increase the percentage of underrepresented groups in pools of applicants from which to select candidates for positions in grades 13 and above over the percentage in FY 2004.

##### **Results**

- We employed people in underrepresented groups so that our percentages matched at least 80 percent of the national averages in three out of six underrepresented groups.
- We increased to 95 percent underrepresented groups in pools of applicants from which to select candidates for positions in grades 13 and above.

*Discussion* NARA is committed to achieving a workforce that reflects the rich diversity of our nation, and we are pleased that we have met or exceeded our representation goals for women, Blacks, and persons with targeted disabilities. Representation of Latino-Hispanics, Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders, and American Indians/Alaskan natives, however, are below the targets we have set.

In response to this challenge and in the context of a larger effort to redesign NARA's existing recruitment strategies, we are working to identify targeted sources of highly qualified Latino-Hispanic applicants for NARA positions, to establish ongoing channels of communication with those sources, and to pursue outreach opportunities where possible.

Potential sources include colleges and universities with high concentrations of Latino-Hispanic students enrolled in history, archives, and other NARA-related programs and disciplines; Latino-Hispanic representatives of professional history, archival, or other relevant organizations or associations; and Latino-Hispanic executive groups such as the National Association for Hispanic Federal Executives. We continue to explore partnerships with organizations that can help inform the Latino-Hispanic community about the mission, work, and career benefits of the National Archives and hope to see an increase in the number of Latino-Hispanics interested in Federal careers in history and archives.

We participated again this year in the Interagency Taskforce on Hispanic Employment meeting sponsored by the Office of Personnel Management to gain best practice information from other Federal agencies who have initiated successful recruitment and hiring programs. Finally, we are looking to increase the use of our student employment programs as a mechanism for attracting Hispanic students to temporary positions within NARA. Student employment work opportunities are an excellent way to introduce students to the work of NARA and to encourage students to pursue future careers in history and archives. For example, this year we participated for the first time in the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities National Internship Program by sponsoring an internship placement for a student from Colorado State University, Pueblo.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
<i>Performance target for percent of applicant pools for positions at grades GS-13 and above that contain people in underrepresented groups</i>	49	64	75	79	90	93
Percent of applicant pools for positions at grades GS-13 and above that contain people in underrepresented groups	63	74	78	89	92	95
Number of applicants for positions at grades GS-13 and above	—	—	1,779	1,177	1,783	1,570
Number of applicant pools for positions in grades GS-13 and above	24	53	101	85	143	131
Number of pools for positions in grades GS-13 and above that had self-identified applicants in underrepresented groups	15	39	79	76	132	124
Percent of Civilian Labor Force rate used to determine if underrepresented groups met employment target	—	50	60	65	70	80
Percent of employees who have received diversity training	19	27	52	72	66	62

Performance Data	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Underrepresented groups of employees meeting target (checkmark indicates target met or exceeded)						
—Women	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
—Black	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
—Latino-Hispanic						
—Asian American/Pacific Islander	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
—American Indian/Alaskan Native	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
—Targeted disability	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* Further examination of our processes for announcing vacancies and hiring will help us determine where we are falling short in meeting our targets for certain underrepresented groups.

5.3 *FEDERAL REGISTER* PRODUCTION

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Accept validated legal documents submitted electronically for publication in the *Federal Register* from 12 agencies.
- Manage 50 percent of all *Federal Register* documents electronically using eDOCS.

**Results**

- ✓ We have 15 agencies registered with the ability to submit documents to the *Federal Register* electronically.
- ✓ We managed 22 percent of all *Federal Register* documents electronically using eDOCS.

*Discussion* We continue to expand the availability of electronic submission of *Federal Register* documents using the Electronic Editing and Publishing System (eDOCS). We are now accepting electronic, digitally signed *Federal Register* document submissions using Certificate Authorities that are cross-certified by the public key infrastructure. To date we have registered a total of 15 agencies to be able to submit documents electronically to the *Federal Register*. We began a reconfiguration of eDOCS to improve performance. This year we used eDOCS to manage more than 7,000 documents, approximately 22 percent of our total workload this year. While we missed the target we set for FY 2005, we have seen a marked increase in the level of work managed using eDOCS. The Federal Bridge Certification Authority (FBCA), an independent Federal entity, is developing and testing applications to enable cross-certification of signatures between different Federal certifying authorities, and we expect these developments will support an increase in the use of eDOCS in FY 2006.

Performance Data	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Performance target for percent of documents <i>Federal Register</i> manages electronically using eDOCS.						50



<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Percent of documents <i>Federal Register</i> manages electronically using eDOCS	—	—	—	—	9	22
Number of documents NARA manages electronically using eDOCS	—	—	—	—	3,032	7,066
Number of documents published in the <i>Federal Register</i>	31,925	32,036	33,055	32,066	32,417	32,429
Percent of documents submitted for publication electronically	—	—	—	—	9	13
Number of documents submitted for publication electronically	—	—	—	—	3,032	4,142
Number of public inspection documents available to the public electronically	—	—	—	—	3,032	9,173
Number of official <i>Federal Register</i> documents retrieved online (in millions)	155	163	150	160	208	142
Number of rulemakings open for comment successfully retrieved at <i>Regulations.gov</i> (in thousands)	—	—	—	371	240	849

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We plan to accept validated legal documents submitted electronically for publication in the *Federal Register* from all agencies and manage 75 percent of all *Federal Register* documents electronically using eDOCS in FY 2006. These goals are linked to our ability to cross-certify agencies' Certificate Authorities using the FBCA. We will also continue to improve and enhance the new system and roll out the e-commerce functionality of eDOCS to more agencies. We will also continue to participate in the development of online rulemaking and interagency process integration, including partnership with the Government Printing Office (GPO).

5.4 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

**FY 2005 Objectives**

- Public network applications are available 97.0 percent of the time.
- Upgrade physical security of NARA's computer infrastructure at 50 percent of NARA locations.
- Implement an enterprise repository for NARA's Enterprise Architecture and associated Information Technology (IT) documentation.
- Complete development of an enterprise-wide disaster recovery plan and an enterprise-wide continuity of operations plan.
- Complete telecommunications upgrade.

**Results**

- Our public network applications were available 99 percent of the time.
- We deployed an initial rollout of the NARA Enterprise Information Technology Repository.

- ✓ We completed continuity of operations plans for our agency leadership and for continued publication of the *Federal Register*.

*Discussion* We deployed an initial rollout of NARA's Enterprise Information Technology Repository (NEITR). NEITR is a system that provides a single, centralized, authoritative source of all information assets associated with NARA's IT systems. The NEITR repository will structure and hold all authoritative IT program information and publish that information on NARA's internal web site for staff use.

We continue to install our integrated telephone system in our facilities nationwide. We completed system design and installation at the new Southeast Regional Records Center (Ellenwood, GA), the Southeast Regional Archives (Morrow, GA), and the Pacific Regional Records Center (Perris, CA). We have completed the detailed station design at our main building in Washington, DC, and are in the process of installing new telephones at all stations in the building.

We developed a plan for the physical security upgrade of the computer infrastructure in our facilities nationwide. The first task in this plan was to complete a configuration identification study to assess the present condition of our computer infrastructure. We completed this study this year. As part of this security upgrade, we have distributed server racks to 80 percent of our locations and have installed and key-locked racks at 19 of the 30 locations where server racks are currently used to make our equipment more secure in those locations.

Regarding disaster recovery and continuity of operations planning, we focused our efforts on enabling the continued NARA operations at the headquarters level and the continued publication of the *Federal Register*. We have identified the critically important functions that the agency must be able to perform if we are to continue to operate and have made these functions the basis for our continuity of operations plan. We have also developed and tested an implementation plan to define the steps and procedures that we will follow to put our continuity of operations plan in operation.

<b>Performance Data</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Percent of public network availability	99.8	99.9	99.9	99.9	100	99.9
<i>Performance target for percent availability of public applications</i>	—	—	—	—	96.5	97.0
Percent of public network applications availability	—	—	—	—	98.7	98.9
Number of total hours that any public network application was unavailable	—	—	—	—	1,047	923
Number of network users for public applications (in millions)	—	—	—	—	4.4	6.6
Cost per network user for public applications	—	—	—	—	\$0.29	\$0.24

*FY 2006 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will continue to improve the physical security of our computer infrastructure. We will also expand our continuity of operations planning to more functions and sites in our agency.

## FY 2005 Program Evaluations

### ***Strategic Goal 1: Records Management***

Office of Management and Budget, *Independent Verification and Validation of E-Government Initiatives*, August 24, 2005.

The Office of Management and Budget contracted with Altarum to undertake an independent verification and validation of e-Government initiatives to ensure that projects are compliant with Federal standards and in line with private industry. There are no recommendations associated with this report.

### ***Strategic Goal 2: Electronic Records***

Government Accountability Office, GAO-05-802, *Acquisition of ERA is Progressing*, July 12, 2005.

The objective of this review was to determine (1) the extent to which NARA has achieved the ERA program's cost, schedule, and performance objectives and defined the risks to future objectives and (2) the status of NARA's efforts to address prior GAO recommendations on the ERA acquisition. The GAO carried forward four of the five prior recommendations but made no new recommendations.

### ***Strategic Goal 3: Access***

Government Accountability Office, GAO Engagement 350684, *DoD/DOE's Classification Management Systems*, March 17, 2005.

GAO is examining the efficiency and effectiveness of DoD's and DOE's classification and declassification operations, including actions the departments have taken to ensure (1) compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and other official guidance; (2) that individuals authorized to classify information or manage the classification systems have been sufficiently trained to do so; and (3) that classification actions are consistently applied department-wide. A report has not been issued.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Audit Memorandum 05-20, *Review of NHPRC Grants*, July 29, 2005.

The Inspector General conducted a review of NHPRC grants. There are no recommendations associated with this audit memorandum.

#### **Strategic Goal 4: Space and Preservation**

Office of Inspector General, OIG Audit Memorandum 05-13, *Evaluation of NARA's Preservation Program*, June 22, 2005.

The Inspector General reviewed NARA's preservation program to determine whether established controls provide adequate assurance that archival records needing preservation are identified and serviced in a timely manner. Nine recommendations were made, and eight remain open.

Office of Administrative Services, *Physical Security and Life Safety Review*, February 24, 2005.

The office conducted a review of the Northeast Region records center in Pittsfield, MA. Three recommendations were made and remain open.

Office of Administrative Services, *Physical Security and Life Safety Review*, April 4, 2005.

The office conducted a review of the Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum. One recommendation was made, which was closed in May 2005.

Office of Administrative Services, *Physical Security and Life Safety Review*, May 30, 2005.

The office conducted a review of the Pacific Region (San Francisco) archives and records center in San Bruno, CA. Three recommendations were made, of which two have been closed.

Office of Administrative Services, *Physical Security and Life Safety Review*, May 31, 2005.

The office conducted a review of the Harry S. Truman Presidential Library and Museum. One recommendation was made and remains open.

Office of Administrative Services, *Physical Security and Life Safety Review*, May 31, 2005.

The office conducted a review of the Central Plains Region Bannister Road facility in Kansas City, MO. One recommendation was made and remains open.

Office of Administrative Services, *Physical Security and Life Safety Review*, June 6, 2005.

The office conducted a review of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library and Museum. Three recommendations were made and remain open.

Office of Administrative Services, *Physical Security and Life Safety Review*, July 26, 2005.

The office conducted a review of the William Jefferson Clinton Presidential Library. Thirteen recommendations were made and remain open.

### **Strategic Goal 5: Infrastructure**

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-21, *Review of Contractor Resources Utilized on the Information Technology Support Services Contract*, September 9, 2005.

The Inspector General evaluated whether the contractor provided the appropriate resources, to determine if contractor personnel were qualified for the positions assigned, and to determine if contractor personnel had the appropriate background investigations required by the contract. Two recommendations, which remain open, were made in this report.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Audit Memorandum 05-19, *Review of Proposed Modification of the Information Technology Support Services Task Order Security Program Requirements*, July 6, 2005.

The Inspector General reviewed the appropriateness of the proposed modifications. There are no recommendations associated with this audit memorandum.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-16, *Prompt Payment Audit*, July 22, 2005.

The Inspector General reviewed compliance with the Prompt Payment rule and tested transactions to determine proper calculations. Two recommendations were made and remain open.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-15, *Audit of the Travel Card Program*, July 22, 2005.

The Inspector General reviewed operation of the travel card program to ascertain whether it is operating in conformance with applicable laws, regulations, and agency policies and procedures. Five recommendations were made and remain open.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-14, *Review of the Information Technology Support Services (ITSS) Contractor's Quality Assurance and Quality Control Program*, August 12, 2005.

The Inspector General evaluated the contractor's quality assurance and quality control program performed under the ITSS contract task order. There are two recommendations, which remain open, associated with this report.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-10, *Review of NARA's Information Technology Investment Management Decide Process Accomplished for the Novell Software Upgrade Project*, March 30, 2005.

The Inspector General reviewed this process to determine if NARA's IT Investment Management Decide Process was used to plan and approve the Novell Netware/GroupWise software upgrade project. Two recommendations were made and remain open.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-09, *Audit of NARA's Intrusion Detection System*, April 1, 2005.

The Inspector General evaluated the current intrusion detection system to determine whether adequate controls are in place to safeguard NARA's information system network and assets. Seven recommendations were made, of which five have been closed.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-07, *Audit of the National Archives Trust Representation Fund*, March 18, 2005.

The Inspector General review was to ensure that the Representational Fund is operating in compliance with pertinent laws and regulations. Three recommendations were made, all of which were closed by May 17, 2005.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-06, *Evaluation of NARA's Processes for Handling Personal Information Collected from the Public*, March 14, 2005.

The Inspector General reviewed this process to determine how NARA handles personal information it collects on selected information forms and to evaluate the adequacy of protections given to this information. One recommendation was made and remains open.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-05, *Review of Management of NARA's Help Desk*, February 23, 2005.

The Inspector General reviewed help desk services to determine if the contractor is providing services that satisfy contractual requirements and meet user expectations. One recommendation was made and remains open.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-01, *Review of NARA's Acquisition of Storage Management*, March 9, 2005.

The Inspector General reviewed NARA's purchase and implementation of Legato software to determine if it was accomplished in accordance with NARA policy. One recommendation was made and remains open.

### ***Multi-Goal Evaluations***

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-08, *Evaluation of NARA's FY 2004 Management Control Program*, February 10, 2005.

The Inspector General reviewed NARA's FY 2004 Management Control Program. No recommendations were made.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 05-02, *Clifton Gunderson LLP (CG) Audit of the National Archives and Records Administration FY 2004 Financial Statements*, November 29, 2004.

The Inspector General contracted with Clifton Gunderson (CG) to review financial statements as well as internal controls and operations. CG made 39

recommendations, of which complete documentation has been provided to the auditors for 31 recommendations.

Office of Regional Records Services, *Program Review*, September 1, 2005.

The office conducted a program review at the Military Personnel Records Center and Civilian Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, MO. Four recommendations were issued.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Program Review*, April 11–13, 2005.

The office conducted a program review at the Harry S. Truman Library in Independence, MO. A final report was issued on September 8, 2005.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Program Review*, August 1–4, 2005.

The office conducted a program review at the William J. Clinton Library in Little Rock, AR. A final report was issued on September 8, 2005.

For more information about these reports, contact the Policy and Planning Staff at 301-837-1850 or by e-mail at [vision@nara.gov](mailto:vision@nara.gov).

## Status of NARA Records Management Initiatives

In FY 2005, we made substantial progress in further implementing the strategies documented in NARA's FY 2003 issuance of *Strategic Directions for Federal Records Management*. The following table provides a brief description of the strategies and specific examples of how these strategies have benefited Federal agencies in the past fiscal year.

Specific Strategy	Brief Description	Benefits to agencies
Appraisal	The policy documents the strategic framework, objectives, and guidelines used to determine archival value. The policy provides general appraisal guidelines as well as guidelines for specific categories of records, including personal data records, observational data from the physical sciences, and environmental health and safety records.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We published proposed guidelines for appraising R&amp;D records of permanent value in the <i>Federal Register</i>. Revised guidelines, incorporating agency comments, will be issued in FY 2006.</li> <li>▪ We developed and internally vetted new guidance on the intrinsic value of records. The guidelines will be incorporated in the appraisal policy in FY 2006.</li> </ul>
Custody	The policy addresses the authority and responsibility of the Archivist for physical and legal custody of permanent Federal records.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We developed procedures for processing and evaluating proposals to establish new affiliated archives.</li> <li>▪ We are in the process of considering new agency affiliates. Affiliated archives relationships allow agencies to maintain physical custody of their holdings while legal custody is maintained by NARA.</li> </ul>
Mandatory Destruction	NARA has simplified the process for agencies to extend retention periods beyond the destruction date specified in the schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regulations implementing this statutory change have been drafted and will be included as part of our overall effort to revise records management regulations.</li> </ul>
Advocacy	We are actively engaging senior Federal agency officials in discussions and meetings on the importance of records management in the Federal government.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NARA's advocacy program has resulted in more than 90 meetings, discussions, and presentations by NARA senior officials to senior agency counterparts (i.e., Archivist and Deputy Archivist meeting with agency leaders, our CIO meeting with other CIOs, our General Counsel meeting with other General Counsels, and office to office head meetings) at other Federal agencies. As a result, senior agency officials are now better informed about records management. In particular, discussions have focused on the immediate and long-term cost benefit of building recordkeeping requirements into the development of IT systems and their ability to access authentic, reliable, and trustworthy records whenever they are needed for their business use.</li> <li>▪ We worked closely with several Federal agencies to stage COOP exercises and assist in COOP-related workshops to share information on vital records and recovery guidance for damaged records. Through these collaborations, we established important contacts with FEMA and GSA officials, resulting in enhanced coordi-</li> </ul>



**National Archives and Records Administration**  
Performance and Accountability Report, FY 2005

Specific Strategy	Brief Description	Benefits to agencies
Training and Certification	NARA has developed a national training program in Federal records management. The program broadens our venue for offering training and offers a certificate of completion in Federal records management to recognize participants' achievements in understanding core records management knowledge areas.	<p>nation and information exchanges in response to the Hurricane Katrina disaster.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We have expanded NARA's web site to include materials that agencies can use as the basis for their own records management training program.</li> <li>▪ We hired a training officer to ensure that NARA offices nationwide follow a uniform approach to records management training and to also ensure that our programs include the most current electronic records management tools and techniques.</li> <li>▪ We are partnering with agencies such as OPM to use tools made available through the e-Government initiatives to leverage our resources in online course offerings to Federal agencies.</li> <li>▪ We continue to conduct numerous forums on electronic records and have developed training geared to agency IT, legal, and program office staffs.</li> <li>▪ We instituted a certification program whereby Federal agency customers attending key training in specific knowledge areas can elect to take an exam. Upon completing and passing all exams, the participant is awarded a certificate of completion of Federal Records management training.</li> </ul>
Federal Records Center Program and Electronic Records Services	The Electronic Records Services team is establishing scanning and electronic media storage services for agency customers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Our Federal Records Center Program continues to progress with our e-media storage pilots. We have procured and installed multimedia storage equipment at one of our regional facilities as we continue to work toward maximizing media life expectancies.</li> <li>▪ We conducted production scan prototypes to identify requirements for upcoming pilots designed to convert large quantities of Federal Agency customers' records from paper format to electronic media.</li> <li>▪ Through our "scan on demand" pilot, we have provided customers a cost-effective service that delivers an electronic file to them on the same day as the request.</li> </ul>
Flexible Scheduling	This proposed approach to scheduling, being piloted among five agencies, allows agencies to schedule temporary records at any level of aggregation that meets their business needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In partnership with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to pilot flexible scheduling, we approved a schedule that supports NOAA's extensive scientific and business interest in retaining data and making it available to a variety of customers on a long-term basis. This flexible schedule allows NOAA to retain more than 150 years of information on hand to serve its customers.</li> </ul>

Specific Strategy	Brief Description	Benefits to agencies
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We approved NASA's flexible schedule, which consolidates more than 180 previously scheduled and unscheduled records into 12 media neutral buckets that provide for the disposition of multiple records associated with NASA's development and administration of mission-related programs and projects. Program and project staffs have offered positive feedback on the new approach and the user friendliness and clarity of the schedule. Official schedule implementation will begin in FY 2006.</li> </ul>
General Records Schedules (GRS)	The GRS efforts are designed to identify and develop additional GRSs for records that are common across Federal agencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We issued a comprehensive GRS for records belonging to Temporary Commissions, Boards, Councils, and Committees. We also issued a GRS for Chief Information Officers.</li> <li>▪ We vetted draft GRS's for records relating to Aircraft Operations and Maintenance and the FAIR Act (OMB A-76).</li> <li>▪ We continued research and development of potential GRS series for Chief Financial Officers, Employee Assistance Programs, Flexiplace, and Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) records.</li> </ul>
Guidance and Regulations	We are continuing efforts at NARA to align our guidance and regulations with changes resulting from the redesign of Federal records management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We revised the regulatory framework for Federal records management and began rewriting the regulations in 36 CFR XII, subchapter B. The revision reorganizes the existing regulations and will incorporate new standards resulting from changes in our recordkeeping environment and the strategies and initiatives NARA has undertaken in our redesign of Federal records management.</li> </ul>
Inspections and Studies	Inspections are reviews of agency recordkeeping practices that focus on serious management problems. Studies are reviews of records management practices in the Federal government.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We developed and issued Standard Operating Procedures to our National Records Management Program staff for conducting studies and inspections.</li> <li>▪ We documented recommendations to Headquarters Air Force (HAF) on HAF recordkeeping practices. HAF implemented both interim and long-range solutions in response to the recommendations.</li> </ul>
Resource Allocation (Focusing Resources)	The resource allocation methodology provides a way for NARA to best use its scarce resources to provide assistance to agencies with records that are at high risk of inappropriate disposition, records with high permanent value, and records that are rated high to protect rights of citizens and accountability of the Federal Government. The benefit of the resource allocation methodology is that NARA is able to concentrate its RM assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We used the results of NARA's FY 2004 Government-wide resource allocation project to help identify lines of business, subfunctions, and agencies for a major e-systems scheduling and appraisal project for FY 2005.</li> </ul>

**National Archives and Records Administration**  
Performance and Accountability Report, FY 2005

---

<b>Specific Strategy</b>	<b>Brief Description</b>	<b>Benefits to agencies</b>
	and other resources in high-priority, high-visibility Federal programs or subfunctions that are of concern to NARA's public customers.	
Targeted Assistance	We have established partnerships with other agencies to solve specific records management problems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We continued to support the Interagency Wildland Fire Records Project. Through this partnership of five agencies, we jointly developed records management tools to improve the way fires are managed and to address the statutory requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Fire Policy Act. We approved records schedules covering electronic and paper records and also developed a legacy records preservation strategy.</li> </ul>
Reporting	We will report to Congress and OMB regarding problems and recommended practices discovered as part of targeted assistance projects or inspections and studies that we conduct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We conducted a benchmark study with Government agencies, university research groups, and private service providers on how business process analysis (BPA) and IT systems development can be used to support electronic recordkeeping. In FY 2006 we will train our staff and other Federal records managers on using BPA to support electronic recordkeeping.</li> </ul>

## Federal Records Management Evaluations

Under 44 U.S.C. 2904(c)(8), the Archivist of the United States is required to report to Congress and OMB annually on the results of records management activities. NARA fulfills this requirement through the Performance and Accountability Report. Through this report, we also highlight the progress of individual agencies in managing and preserving the documentation necessary to protect the legal and financial rights of the Government and citizens.

In FY 2005, we began to use our Resource Allocation methodology and the OMB Business Reference Model (BRM) to target our assistance to Federal agencies. In September 2004 we completed an analysis of business processes, subfunctions, and agency activities across the Government, based on the OMB BRM, to identify those that are the most significant to protect legal rights, document government accountability, and preserve records that document the national experience. Using these criteria, we identified 13 business lines and 23 business subfunctions where we perceived the records to be at highest risk.

We used this analysis to target our records management assistance to help agencies in these subfunctions schedule their critical electronic records systems. We targeted our efforts to 245 specific electronic systems and, with agency support, we developed 80 schedules to cover these systems. In FY 2006 we will work with agencies to increase the number of critical electronic records schedules by 10 percent.

In addition, we are reporting on nine Federal programs that have shown significant progress in preserving and assuring timely maximum access to the American people of our governmental records. NARA partnered with the agencies in these activities, often through targeted assistance.

### ***Office of the Secretary of Defense***

The Directives and Records Division of the Executive Services Directorate of the Department of Defense Washington Headquarters Services recognized the critical need to preserve and protect the records of the Coalitional Provisional Authority in Iraq. The Division aggressively pursued the task, going up the chain of command to get the required authority and resources. Subsequently, with two separate deployments to Baghdad, Iraq, of 12 people over 56 days, the Directives and Records Division planned, organized, and conducted the image capture of 760,424 pages, the collection of 1.5 terabytes of electronic records, and the shipment of over 300,000 pages to the Washington National Records Center.

### ***Department of the Treasury, Office of the CIO***

The Department of the Treasury is a large agency, and the Office of the Chief Information Officer promotes records management through senior-level support, the issuance of a new agency newsletter, and other public relations tools, including a successful annual Records and Information Management Month program, which includes training, managers' briefings, and exhibits.

### ***Internal Revenue Service***

The IRS records management program has coordinated the successful development of online and web-based training for over 1,000 Information Resource Coordinators. The IRS shared its web-based training with other agencies where it is being adapted to their programs. The training was influential in the development of NARA's own web-based records management training. The IRS also developed web-based records and information management procedural and process guides that are easily available and used by all employees.

### ***Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Department of the Interior, National Park Service***

The Interagency Wildland Fire Records Project was a partnership of five agencies that developed records management tools to improve the way fires are managed and to address the statutory requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Fire Policy Act. These agencies developed new standards and tools to control and preserve both paper and electronic wildland fire records both during a fire incident and afterwards. These standards and tools will allow the agencies to support fire operations more effectively and protect rights and interests of stakeholders. Just as important, they will allow fire agencies to permanently preserve records supporting scientific and historical research, implementation of National Fire Policy, and planning under the National Environmental Policy Act.

This partnership reflects the Office of Management and Budget's Business Reference Model "lines of business" by scheduling records across multiple agencies.

### ***Federal Bureau of Investigation***

The Records Automation Section of the Records Management Division developed a program to review systems for certification as electronic recordkeeping systems. The program requires close cooperation with the Office of the CIO to identify systems and develop recordkeeping requirements for the enterprise architecture, as well as with the Security Division for computer security certification and accreditation. The electronic recordkeeping system certification program is up and operating at the FBI. The Electronic Recordkeeping Certification Manual describes the process in detail and provides all the tools necessary to complete certification. It does this in a comprehensive way that can be easily adapted and adopted by other agencies.

## Performance Assessment Rating Tool Summary

### Records Services Program

As part of the FY 2005 budget, OMB evaluated NARA's records services program using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). PART was established to provide a process for rating the performance of programs across the Federal Government. The chart below summarizes OMB's findings, NARA's responses, and the current status of our progress in implementing the recommendations as well as FY 2005 results for PART measures.

OMB Recommendation	NARA's Response to OMB's Finding	Status of Progress	
1. Develop targets for newly created unit-cost measures.	NARA developed a standard methodology for collecting unit cost measures in FY 2004. Data was collected for the first time for many new cost measures in FY 2004 and FY 2005. Targets will be set where appropriate after-measurement methodologies are established and tested.	NARA included 13 new cost metrics in the FY 2004 performance plan and developed a methodology for collecting the data for the first time in FY 2004. These data are reported in the Performance section of this report. We are monitoring trends to determine where targets are appropriate.	
2. Produce audited financial statements.		Completed.	
Selected PART Measures	Year	Target	Actual
Annual cost of archival storage space per cubic feet of traditional holdings	2005	No annual target	\$6.48
By 2005, 95 percent of requests for military service separation records are answered within 10 working days	2005	95	88
By 2009, 100 percent of NARA's archival holdings are in appropriate space	2005	No annual target	53% traditional holdings, 100% electronic holdings, 42% artifact holdings
By 2009, 100 percent of NARA records centers comply with the October 2009 regulatory storage standards	2005	No annual target	9

**Electronic Records Services Program**

As part of the FY 2006 budget, OMB evaluated NARA's electronic records services program using the PART. The chart below summarizes OMB's findings, NARA's responses, and the current status of our progress in implementing the recommendations, as well as FY 2005 results for PART measures.

OMB Recommendation	NARA's Response to OMB's Finding		Status of Progress
1. Work on resolving the basis for its material weakness in IT security.	We plan to complete all actions to resolve this material weakness during FY 2005.		This material weakness was resolved during FY 2005. (See enclosure B in Appendix B, FMFIA Report, for details.)
2. Implement and utilize earned value management for acquisition of the Electronic Records Archives.	We plan to fully implement earned value management for ERA in FY 2004.		EVM is used in day-to-day management of the ERA program. The development contractor also is held to EVM standards and reports to NARA on a monthly basis.
3. Refine its records management policies and strategies and engage with Federal agencies to continue methods of improving records management across the Federal Government.	We plan to continue implementing the strategies identified in Strategic Directions for Federal Records Management to guide, advocate, and lead the improvement of records management methods across the Federal Government.		See progress made in FY 2005 on page 96 of this report.
Selected PART Measures	Year	Target	Actual
Percentage of archival electronic records accessioned by NARA at the scheduled time.	2005	20%	TBD
The per megabyte cost of managing archival electronic records through the Electronic Records Archives will decrease each year	2005	Target pending development of ERA	N/A
Milestone measures for development of the Electronic Records Archives in 2005 include completing design reviews and selecting a final contractor for the system.	2005	Annual measures	Design reviews successfully completed and contractor (Lockheed Martin) selected to develop ERA.

## Definitions

The following provides definitions for many of the terms and concepts used in this Performance Section.

<b>Goal 1</b>	<b>Records Management</b>
Targeted assistance partnership	Established with an underlying written agreement between NARA and a Federal agency to identify and agree upon a specific project or projects to solve the agency's records management problems. The agreement must take the form of a project plan, memorandum of understanding (MOU), or similar written documentation that performs the same function as a project plan. The agreement has mutually agreed-upon criteria for successful completion of the targeted assistance project or projects. An agreement can include several projects, each with its own success criteria.
Asset and risk management	Determining the value of information as a business asset in terms of its primary and secondary uses in the business process; identifying potential risks to the availability and usefulness of the information; estimating the likelihood of such risks occurring; evaluating the consequences if the risk occurs; and managing the information based on that analysis.
Records management service components (RMSC)	An application or system software that incorporates interfaces for interacting with other programs and that is made available to all Federal agencies for use in their enterprise architecture. The RMSC will provide the ability to embed records management functionality in the IT structure of the enterprise.
Records schedule	A document, having legally binding authority when approved by NARA, that provides mandatory instructions (i.e., disposition authority) for what to do with records no longer needed for current business.
Schedule item	Records subject to a specific disposition authority that appear on a records schedule.
<b>Goal 2</b>	<b>Electronic Records</b>
Accession	Archival materials whose legal custody is transferred to NARA.
File units	Data files of electronic records, most often in the form of a database.
Logical data record	A set of data processed as a unit by a computer system or application independently of its physical environment. Examples: a word processing document; a spreadsheet; an e-mail message; each row in each table of a relational database or each row in an independent logical file database.
Preserved	Electronic file preservation requires that (1) the physical file containing one or more logical data records has been identified and its location, format, and internal structure(s) specified; (2) logical data records within the file are physically readable and retrievable; (3) the media, the physical files written on them, and the logical data records they contain are managed to ensure continuing accessibility; and (4) an audit trail is maintained to document record integrity.



Online visits	One instance in which a person uses our web site is counted as one "visit." It is a count of the number of times our web site is accessed and is similar to counting the number of people who walk through our front door. In contrast, it does not count "hits," which refer to the number of files used to show the user a web page. A session in which a user accessed a web page comprising 35 files would count as one visit and 35 hits. Counting visits is a more accurate way of showing use of our web site.
Megabyte	A measure of computer data storage capacity. A megabyte is 2 to the 20th power, or approximately a million bytes.
Gigabyte	A measure of computer data storage capacity. A gigabyte is 2 to the 30th power, or approximately a billion bytes (that is, thousand megabytes).
Terabyte	A measure of computer data storage capacity. A terabyte is 2 to the 40th power, or approximately a trillion bytes (that is, a thousand gigabytes).

<b>Goal 3</b>	<b>Access</b>
---------------	---------------

ARC	Archival Research Catalog, NARA-wide online catalog.
User hits	The number of files used to show the user a web page. This is not the preferred method for measuring web usage. Counting online visits is more accurate and became available for ARC in 2004.
Traditional holdings	Books, papers, maps, photographs, motion pictures, sound and video recordings, and other documentary material that are not stored on electronic media.
Artifact holdings	Three-dimensional objects made, modified, or used by humans.
Electronic holdings	Records on electronic storage media.
Inventory	A listing of the volume, scope, and complexity of an organization's records.
Written requests	Requests for services that arrive in the form of letters, faxes, e-mail messages, and telephone calls that have been transcribed. Excludes Freedom of Information Act requests, personnel information requests at the National Personnel Records Center, Federal agency requests for information, fulfillment of requests for copies of records, requests for museum shop products, subpoenas, and special access requests.
Federal agency reference request	A request by a Federal agency to a records center for the retrieval of agency records. Excludes personnel information requests at the National Personnel Records Center.
Classified document review	A review by ISOO of an Executive branch agency to identify inconsistencies in the application of classification and marking requirements of Executive Order 12958. The results of the review along with any appropriate recommendations for improvement are reported to the agency head or agency senior official for the program.
Program review	An evaluation of selected aspects of an executive branch agency's security classification program to determine whether an agency has met the requirements of Executive Order 12958. The review may include

security education and training, self-inspections, declassification, safeguarding, and classification activity. The results of a review, along with any appropriate recommendations for improvement, are reported to the agency senior official or agency head.

Equity-holding agency A Federal agency that may have classified information in a document, whether or not it created the document. Without declassification guidelines, only the equity-holding agency can declassify information in the document.

**Goal 4 Space and Preservation**

Appropriate space Storage area that meets physical and environmental standards for the type of materials stored there.

At-risk Records that have a media base near or at the point of deterioration, to such an extent that the image or information in the physical media of the record is being or soon will be lost, or records that are stored on media accessible only through obsolete or near-obsolete technology.

**Goal 5 Infrastructure**

Staff development plan An individualized plan to enhance employees' knowledge, skills, and abilities and improve performance in their current jobs or of duties outside their current jobs, in response to organizational needs and human resource plans.

Applicant Anyone who has applied for a specific position.

Underrepresented groups Groups of people tracked by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Minority groups (Black, Latino-Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native); Women; People with Disabilities.

NARANET A collection of local area networks installed in 36 NARA facilities that are connected to a wide area network at Archives II, using frame relay telecommunications, and then to the Internet. NARANET includes personal computers with a standardized suite of software. NARANET was designed to be modular and scalable using standard hardware and software components.