SECTION 2
# PERFORMANCE SECTION

## Measuring and Reporting Our Performance

This annual performance report is based on the goals, strategies, and long-range performance objectives set forth in our 2006 Strategic Plan and the annual objectives in our FY 2009 Performance Budget. The following pages detail our performance on our FY 2009 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 links 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. For more than ten years, we have collected agency-wide data in our 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 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 prior year statistics that we corrected because of these improvements. These ongoing refinements indicate that this report, our annual plans, and our Strategic Plan are living documents and an integral part of our operations.

Our performance measurement system, which we continuously work to improve, takes advantage of web infrastructure to collect performance data from the more than 70 organizational units that send data to PMRS from all over the country. We also use robust, enterprise-level databases to store the data and generate reports, instead of high-maintenance desktop databases previously used. As a result, we are able to collect our performance data more consistently and more efficiently and store much more data for use in analyzing trends. We have leveraged this technology and operationally integrated data collection to create a performance measurement database that serves the entire agency and is the single strategic performance data source for the agency.

Our program management system (PROMT) helps us control the cost and schedule for the Electronic Records Archives (ERA) program and other programs. 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 calcu-lating earned value.

# FY 2009 Performance by Strategic Goal

## Strategic Goal 1: Our Nation's Record Keeper

*As the nation's record keeper, we will ensure the continuity and effective operations of Federal programs by expanding our leadership and services in managing the Government's records*

**Long-Range Performance Targets**

1.1  By 2012, 85 percent of senior Federal agency managers view their records management program as a positive tool for risk mitigation.

1.2  By 2012, 90 percent of customers are highly satisfied with NARA records management services.

1.3  By 2012, the Federal Records Center Program annually retains 98 percent of its customers.

1.4  Within 30 days of the end of an administration, 100 percent of Presidential and Vice Presidential materials have been moved to NARA locations or NARA-approved facilities.

1.5  By 2009, 100 percent of our Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP) meet the requirements for viability.

1.6  By 2009, NARA has established partnerships with FEMA to support 100 percent of its regions in the national response to emergencies.

**FY 2009 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:**     $46,501,000; 1,589 FTE

1.1  FEDERAL RECORDS MANAGEMENT

**FY 2009 Objectives**

☑ Analyze survey results to assess the views of senior Federal agency managers about their records management programs as positive tools for risk mitigation.

☐ Conduct one records management study.

☐ Establish baseline for CFO and selected agencies' critical functions covered by records schedules.

☑ Develop methodology and process for conducting and reporting records management oversight activities.

**Results**

&#10003;   We investigated online survey tools as a potential method to improve survey response rate.

&#10003;   We developed the methodology to conduct a records management study on the evolution of the web in Federal agencies and the effects on recordkeeping.

&#10003;   We identified CFO Act and selected other agencies for an exercise to review critical functions in agency records schedules.

&#10003;   We developed a methodology to conduct records management oversight, and implemented and disseminated a Federal agency self-assessment tool to assist us in understanding the state of Federal agencies' records management programs.

*Discussion*   NARA's *Strategic Directions for Federal Records Management* is our plan for creating relationships with agencies that advance records management as a part of the Government's mission.  Our guidance, training, and assistance to agencies focus on using records management to effectively support agency business processes and mitigate risk to agency programs.  We conducted surveys in FY 2006 and FY 2008, initially directed at Chief Information Officers, and later expanded to include General Counsels and Chief Financial Officers within a select group of agencies.  Although the feedback we received has been invaluable, we were unable to statistically validate the findings due to low survey response rates.  In FY 2009 we considered alternative data collection methods to improve response rates and investigated using an online hosted survey.

In FY 2008, GAO conducted an evaluation of NARA and issued a report (GAO-08-742) titled "Federal Records—National Archives and Selected Agencies Need to Strengthen E-Mail Management."  The purpose of GAO's study was to evaluate and understand practices agencies follow to identify and manage e-mail that meets the criteria of a Federal record.  In this report, GAO recommended that NARA exercise its statutory authority, as defined in the Federal Records Act, and implement oversight mechanisms to ensure that agencies follow records management guidelines when managing their e-mail records.   In response to GAO's recommendations, we developed a methodology and a process for conducting and reporting oversight activities on Federal agencies' records management programs.  Part of this methodology requires Federal agency records officers to conduct a mandatory self-assessment where they document the condition of their records management programs.  Working with input from agency focus groups, we developed guidance documents for conducting general records management self-assessments and approaches for reviewing and scoring agency programs.  The guidance includes key triggers to alert us to agency programs that may require detailed inspections.  We expect that the self-assessments will provide pertinent information on records management programs and risk mitigation, allowing us to replace the Federal agency bi-annual survey with data gathered through the self-assessments.

NARA revised and reorganized the existing regulations on Federal records management to update records management strategies and techniques.  We also revised the regulation

to incorporate plain language to make the regulations easier to read, understand, and use. The regulations will become effective in early FY 2010.

Also during this year, we developed the methodology to conduct a records management study to understand the evolution of the web in agencies and its impact on recordkeeping. We will examine new technologies such as wikis, blogs, and other types of social media to identify different ways in which agencies may create records.

Finally, in an effort to ensure that the most critical records of agencies are safeguarded and preserved, we will conduct an exercise that targets specific CFO Act agencies. We have identified the agencies and we will identify three to eight critical agency functions per targeted agency to validate coverage in records schedules.

| Performance Data | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of senior Federal agency managers who view their records management programs as a positive tool for asset and risk management.* | – | – | *Establish baseline* | – |
| Percent of senior Federal agency managers who view their records management programs as a positive tool for risk mitigation. | 81* | – | 64 | – |
| *Performance target for CFO critical functions covered by records schedules.* | – | – | – | *Establish baseline* |
| Percent of CFO critical functions covered by records schedules. | – | – | – | – |

*The FY 2006 survey was limited to Chief Information Officer responses. The FY 2008 survey included General Counsels, Chief Financial Officers, and Chief Information Officers.*

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will implement our methodology and process for conducting records management oversight activities for Federal agencies and report the results of our oversight to OMB and Congress.

1.2 NARA RECORDS MANAGEMENT SERVICES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | Increase by 10 percent the number of records management training participants who are taking a NARA records management course for the first time. |
| | ☐ | 85 percent of Federal agency customers are highly satisfied with NARA records management services. |
| | ☑ | Identify and implement distance learning techniques most effective for NARA to expand customer base. |
| | ☐ | 75 percent of all agencies have registered schedules with NARA covering all existing electronic information systems. |

**Results**

*"I will go back to the office and discuss records!"*

✓ We nearly tripled the number of records management training participants taking a NARA records management course for the first time.

✓ Eighty-one percent of our Federal agency customers are highly satisfied with NARA records management services.

✓ We selected webinars and video-conferencing delivery systems as effective distance learning techniques to expand our customer base.

✓ Thirty percent of all agencies have registered schedules with NARA covering existing electronic information systems.

*Discussion*   NARA's ability to provide agency records managers and records management staff with tools to assist them in identifying and managing their records is critical to ensuring that important records documenting the rights of citizens, the actions of the Federal Government, and information of historical relevance, is not lost.  We strive to increase the Government's records management resources by identifying and tackling records management challenges particular to the Federal Government, and by training and certifying records managers throughout the Federal Government.  Our National Training program broadened its reach in 2009; we tripled the number of first-time training participants over last year.  We attribute this significant growth to the number of new participants accessing our online courses.  In addition, the overall number of Federal agency staff trained in records management and electronic records management exceeds 12,000, a 91 percent increase from the number trained last year.  More than 1,100 people have received professional records management certification since 2005.

Every two years, we survey our Federal agency customers to determine their satisfaction with our records management services.   Our success in providing agencies with the records management tools they need is the basis for evaluating our service to the Federal Government.   This year we designed our survey to obtain information on agency familiarity and satisfaction with our records scheduling and appraisal services.  We used survey software and received feedback from 40 percent of our target audience.  Preliminary findings suggest that 81 percent of respondents are satisfied with the records management services we provide to agencies.  However, customers remain concerned with the length of time it takes to process records schedules.

NARA's National Records Management Training Program continues to pursue training venues that support customers in remote locations or those unable to attend our traditional workshops.  In FY 2007 we piloted the *Basic Records Operations* and *Vital Records* curricula using a web-based delivery system.  Based on the success of the pilot, we continued to expand distance learning course offerings and adapted *RM for IT Professionals* in FY 2009.

We continue to work with agencies to address electronic records issues.  In FY 2008 we re-issued a bulletin that directed agencies to schedule by September 30, 2009, all their electronic records and systems that existed since December 17, 2005.   We offered workshops and consulting assistance to agencies and worked with the Federal Records

Council to collect data from key agencies. Despite our efforts, input from the agencies reflect continued low rates of scheduling electronic systems. We anticipate the upcoming use of NARA's mandatory Federal agency self-assessment tool will influence agencies' efforts to increase their electronic records and systems scheduled.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent increase in the number of Federal agency customers that are satisfied with NARA records management services.* | – | *10* | *10* | – | *10* |
| Percent of Federal agency customers that are satisfied with NARA records management services.* | 57 | 78 | 81 | 81 | 81 |
| *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.* | *10* | *10* | *10* | *10* | *10* |
| Percent increase in the number of records management training participants taking a NARA records management course for the first time. | 142 | 39 | 43 | 20 | 198 |
| Percent of records management training participants taking a NARA records management course for the first time. | 32 | 35 | 42 | 40 | 63 |
| Number of records management training participants who are taking a NARA records management course for the first time. | 1,069 | 1,484 | 2,122 | 2,553 | 7,612 |
| Number of Federal agency staff receiving NARA training in records management and electronic records management. | 3,366 | 4,234 | 5,047 | 6,318 | 12,079 |
| Number of records management training participants that NARA certified this year. | 45 | 275 | 269 | 310 | 242 |
| Median time for records schedule items completed (in calendar days). | 372 | 334 | 284 | 315 | 302 |
| Average age of schedule items completed (in calendar days). | 339 | 374 | 452 | 443 | 416 |
| Number of schedule items completed. | 4,248 | 3,884 | 2,983 | 3,282 | 3,223 |
| Number of open schedules in the backlog. | 379 | 362 | 432 | 579 | 1,015 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will continue to look at ways to attract more first time participants to our records management training programs. We plan to increase the number of courses offered through distance-learning techniques to broaden our customer base and draw in first time participants. We will analyze, prioritize, and implement recommendations identified from surveys of our existing Federal agency customers to understand their satisfaction with NARA records management services.

1.3 FEDERAL RECORDS CENTER PROGRAM

**FY 2009 Objectives**  ☑  Increase the number of cubic feet stored by the Federal Records Center Program (FRCP) by 1 percent.

☑  Make ready 97 percent of Federal agency reference requests within the promised time.

☐     Answer 80 percent of written requests to the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) within 10 working days.

☑     Rollout the Archives and Records Center Information System (ARCIS) to more than 90 percent of all Federal Records Centers nationwide.

☑     Establish baseline customer satisfaction with National Personnel Records Center services.

**Results**

✔     The Federal Records Center Program experienced a 2.4 percent volume increase in its holdings.

✔     We provided 97 percent of reference requests to Federal agency customers within the promised time.

*"The promptness of receiving my requested information was fantastic."*

✔     Our customers received answers to 69 percent of their written requests to the National Personnel Records Center within 10 working days.

✔     We successfully deployed ARCIS to more than 90 percent of our Federal Records Centers throughout the country.

✔     Eighty-five percent of our customers are satisfied with the National Personnel Records Center's handling of their requests for military records.

*Discussion*   NARA's reimbursable Federal Records Center Program (FRCP) plays a vital role in the lifecycle of Federal records. Federal agency customers have access to a host of services designed to assist them with the transfer, storage, and service of their non-current records. In FY 2009, we experienced a 2.4 percent increase in the annual volume of records stored this year. Efforts to market our Federal Records Center Program products and services, conduct outreach activities, and offer courses in *Basic Records Operations* have been successful in maintaining a steady rate of growth in our annual volume of records stored in FRCs. Changes in volume do not always reflect retirement of agency records to the FRC, but can also vary because records previously prohibited from disposal due to a court order, for example, become eligible for disposal. However, taken together with stable customer retention, we view increasing volume as a positive indicator for business. The FRCP retained 100 percent of its customers in FY 2009, and met the target to make ready Federal agency reference requests within a 24-hour period.

We fell short of our target to respond to written requests to the National Personnel Records Center within ten working days. We experienced delays in our response times to written requests to the National Personnel Records Center due to several factors. In the past two years, the number of requests increased by 19 percent with an average 23,000 requests per week. In addition, staff previously dedicated to one facility were

required to service requests from two locations, as we moved records from the old Civilian Personnel Records building to the new National Personnel Records Center annex in Valmeyer, IL. Although we adjusted our resources to manage demand, the combination of these factors affected overall performance.

The accuracy and timeliness of our responses are very important to veterans and their families. In the late 1990s our slow rate of response led to close scrutiny of NPRC by the Government Accountability Office (GAO). We developed new work processes, new information systems, and improved customer service. Between 2001 and 2008, we reduced our response time from 89 working days down to 11. Recently our response times for military personnel records have been increasing. We average 17.5 working days for military requests. We have set a target to specifically focus on military personnel records and reduce the response time to 10 working days or less by 2012.

The Archives and Records Center Information System (ARCIS) is a system designed to electronically manage records storage and improve the efficiency of storage processes in Federal records centers. It supports streamlined business processes and at full implementation will allow customers to receive real-time, web-enabled access to their holdings and transaction information. We made substantial progress in the deployment of ARCIS during FY 2009. We implemented ARCIS at all regional locations with the exception of the NPRC in St. Louis, scheduled for early FY 2010. Proper management of our storage areas is key to ensuring that records in our FRCs remain accessible when needed.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of customers retained by Federal Records Centers annually.* | — | — | *98* | *98* | *98* |
| Percent of customers retained by FRC's annually. | — | — | 100 | 100* | 100 |
| Number of customers (agreements) served annually. | — | — | 142 | 250 | 250 |
| Number of new customers (agreements) per year. | — | — | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| *Performance target for percent increase in cubic feet of holdings stored by Federal Records Center Program.* | — | — | — | *1* | *1* |
| Percent increase in cubic feet of holdings stored by Federal Records Center Program. | — | 2 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 2.4 |
| *Performance target for percent of customers satisfied with NPRC services.* | — | — | — | — | *Establish baseline* |
| Percent of customers satisfied with NPRC services. | — | — | — | — | 85 |
| *Performance target for percent of Federal agency reference requests ready within the promised time.* | *95* | *95* | *95* | *96* | *97* |
| Percent of Federal agency reference requests ready within the promised time. | 97 | 98 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| *Performance target for customers with appointments for whom records are waiting at the appointed time.* | *99* | *99* | *99* | *99* | *99* |
| Percent of customers with appointments for whom records are waiting at the appointed time. | 99.4 | 99.8 | 99.9 | 99.9 | 99.9 |
| *Performance target for percent of written requests to the National Personnel Records Center answered within 10 working days.* | — | — | *75* | *75* | *80* |
| Percent of written requests to the NPRC answered within 10 working days. | 59 | 67 | 65 | 74 | 69 |
| Number of written requests to the NPRC answered within 10 working days (in thousands). | 606 | 739 | 740 | 854 | 845 |
| Number of written requests for civilian records to the | 162 | 179 | 174 | 167 | 94 |

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NPRC answered within 10 working days (in thousands). | | | | | |
| Number of written requests for military records to the NPRC answered within 10 working days (in thousands). | 444 | 559 | 566 | 687 | 751 |
| Number of written requests to the NPRC answered (in thousands). | 1,031 | 1,110 | 1,139 | 1,216 | 1,314 |
| *Performance target for requests for military service separation records at the NPRC answered within 10 working days.* | *95* | *95* | *95* | *–* | *–* |
| Percent of requests for military service separation records at the NPRC answered within 10 working days. | 88 | 91 | 90 | 95 | 95 |
| Number of military service separation records (DD-214) requests answered (in thousands). | 352 | 442 | 475 | 506 | 574 |
| Percent of requests for all military service records at the NPRC in St. Louis answered within 10 working days. | 52 | 61 | 59 | 72 | 70 |
| Average price per request for military service separation records. | $29.70 | $29.70 | $29.70 | $30.10 | $31.70 |

*\*In FY 2007, the customer count excluded customers with annual billings less than $10K. In FY 2008, the bar was lowered and customer count includes customers with annual billings in excess of $5K.*

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   We will work to improve our customer service by increasing the percent of times we have agency reference requests ready within the promised time. We will provide answers to written requests to the National Personnel Records Center within 10 working days. We will expand ARCIS to include integration of retrieval tools for military and civilian personnel and medical records in the National Personnel Records Center, improved reporting capabilities and an enhanced customer portal. In FY 2010 our new Strategic Plan calls for us to begin new measurement in transactions performed.

1.4 PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITIONS

| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | Hire remaining complement of staff for George W. Bush Presidential Library. |
|---|---|---|
| | ☑ | Occupy temporary facility for George W. Bush Administration records. |
| | ☑ | Transfer 100 percent of George W. Bush Administration Presidential and Vice Presidential records and artifacts to NARA. |
| **Results** | ✓ | The George W. Bush Library became an official organizational unit within NARA with a full complement of staff. |
| | ✓ | We leased and occupied a temporary facility in Lewisville, TX, to house the holdings and artifacts of the George W. Bush Administration. |
| | ✓ | We successfully planned and executed the transfer of records and artifacts documenting the Presidential administration of George W. Bush |

from the White House to NARA.

*Discussion*  On January 20, 2009, NARA became the legal custodian of the records and artifacts documenting the Presidential Administration of George W. Bush.  With the volume of records, both in paper and electronic form, significantly higher than all previous collections of Presidential records, we began the move of records in October 2008.  With the assistance of the Department of Defense, we successfully transferred nearly 740,000 pounds of records and artifacts to the George W. Bush temporary library site in Lewisville, TX.  We will transport several artifacts in early FY 2010 due to the time needed to design and build customized crates and complicated housing for safe and secure shipment to the temporary library.

During this year, we augmented the staff at the George W. Bush temporary library.  We hired archivists and museum professionals to undertake the complex work required to review and process Presidential records and other materials to ensure that these records are available to the public in a timely manner.

The unclassified electronic records from the George W. Bush Administration were ingested in our Electronic Records Archives (ERA), Executive Office of the President (EOP) release, and are being used for NARA searches for special access requests.  A smaller volume of classified and Federal records transferred by the EOP are secured in standalone systems until they can be brought into ERA.

1.5 CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS

| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☐ | 100 percent of our Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP) meet the requirements for viability. |
|---|---|---|
| | ☑ | Manage 100 percent of the documents submitted for publication in the Federal Register using eDOCs. |
| | ☐ | Complete re-badging of NARA Federal employees to meet Federal Government standards. |
| | ☑ | Complete installation of Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 201 compliant access control system in Washington, DC. |
| | ☑ | Identify and make accessible NARA's vital records that support continuation of essential functions and recovery to normal operations. |
| | ☐ | Acquire, install, and achieve operational functionality of all required interoperable communication capabilities for continuity operations at primary and alternate facilities. |
| **Results** | ✓ | We identified and documented the vital records |

needed to continue essential functions and resume normal operations in our continuity plan.

✓ We continue to electronically manage 100 percent of the documents submitted for publication in the Federal Register through our Electronic Editing and Publishing system (eDOCS).

✓ We issued credentials to more than 85 percent of NARA employees to meet Federal policy.

✓ We replaced identification card readers in our National Archives in Washington, DC facility to comply with federal standards for access control.

✓ We uploaded and tested our vital records plan at our COOP site in West Virginia to ensure that records needed to perform NARA's mission essential functions are available.

✓ We acquired mobile communications capabilities to support in transit communication of senior leadership during a continuity event.

*Discussion* Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP) are required to ensure that agencies and facilities can continue to perform essential functions under a broad range of circumstances. The requirements for viability of these plans are spelled out in Federal Continuity Policy and include ongoing exercises of the plans and frequent assessments. This year, we identified NARA's vital records necessary to continue essential functions and resume normal operations throughout all phases of a continuity situation. We conducted an internal survey to identify vital records related to mission essential functions throughout the agency and used this data to develop NARA's Vital Records Plan. We tested the efficacy of this plan during a COOP exercise to simulate responses and coordination in emergency situations. To maintain an effective vital records program, our plan incorporates periodic updates to ensure that vital records are reliably current, available, and accessible during an emergency. In addition, we made significant headway in identifying the order of succession in an emergency situation. We have identified orders of succession for our senior staff and mission essential personnel in the Washington, DC, area and continue to identify orders of succession for regional and field personnel.

Additionally, we made substantial progress in documenting procedures to contact and account for all employees in the event of an emergency. We drafted policies to efficiently gather and maintain emergency contact information and acquired a messaging system for employees and stakeholders to contact the agency and obtain information or report their status through an automated process.

Federal Continuity Policy requires that we ensure the availability and redundancy of critical communication capabilities at alternate sites in the event of a disaster or threat that may adversely affect the performance of Government's National Essential Functions (NEF). All agencies that support National Essential Functions are required to maintain

communication capabilities at their headquarters location as well as at an alternate site. NARA's responsibility to publish Presidential and Federal Government documents in the *Federal Register* is a mission essential function that supports an NEF.   In FY 2009, we achieved several milestones to ensure critical communication capability at primary and alternate facilities.  We acquired all necessary mobile communications capabilities required to support agency senior leadership while in transit to alternate operating facilities, and we trained continuity personnel in the use of communications equipment and information technology systems required during a continuity event .

We experienced delays in implementing communications requirements to support continuation of agency mission essential functions at both the National Archives in College Park, MD, and at our alternate site in Rocket Center, WV.  At our alternate facility, we established user accounts and trained operators on secure networks to ensure the facility is mission capable under all but catastrophic conditions that would cause a complete loss of all redundant wire, wireless, and data networks connectivity.  We anticipate completion at both facilities in FY 2010.

Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12*, Policy for a Common Identification Standard for Federal Employees*, requires all Federal agencies to issue Federal Identity Cards (FICs) that comply with the standards contained in FIPS 201-1.  This year more than 85 percent of NARA employees received Federal Identity Cards.   Delays occurred in the regions where employees were not located near credentialing centers.   We replaced card readers with FIPS compliant access control key card readers in our Washington, DC, facility.

The Office of the Federal Register successfully operates in an electronic work environment.  The Electronic Editing and Publishing System (eDOCS) enables agencies to electronically submit digitally signed, legal documents to our office.  Using the digital signature capability, offices can eliminate the use of paper during the entire process and experience efficiencies and cost savings.  More than 1,000 offices and 300 Federal departments and agencies send documents from all over the United States to us for publication in the *Federal Register*.  We process an average of 150 documents each day. Thousands of *Federal Register* and public inspection documents are retrieved online each month.  More than 204 million online retrievals of *Federal Register* documents were made this year.  We successfully managed 100 percent of the documents electronically submitted for publication throughout the year.

At the Office of the Federal Register, we also instituted an extensive telework program using the capabilities of our electronic editing and publishing system, eDOCS, to distribute its operations geographically and ensure the viability of the mission essential *Federal Register* publication program.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of developed NARA Continuity of Operations Plans that achieve viability.* | — | — | *100* | *100* | *100* |
| Percent of NARA Continuity of Operations Plans that achieve viability. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of approved continuity of operation plans. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| *Performance target for percent of documents Office of the Federal Register manages electronically using eDOCS.* | *50* | *75* | *75* | *85* | *100* |
| Percent of documents Office of the Federal Register manages electronically using eDOCS. | 22 | 59 | 81 | 92 | 100 |
| Number of documents managed electronically using | 7,066 | 18,316 | 24,849 | 28,683 | 32,466 |

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| eDOCS. | | | | | |
| Number of digitally-signed, legal documents submitted using eDOCS. | 4,142 | 3,258 | 5,672 | 6,651 | 9,151 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   While our work to ensure NARA is prepared for continuity of Government and continuity of operations in the event of an emergency or catatrosphic event will continue, we have achieved substantial progress and this work will no longer be tracked at a strategic level.

1.6  RECORDS IN THE NATIONAL RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | Establish a supportive partnership in the national response to emergencies in 100 percent of FEMA regions. |
| | ☑ | Offer emergency planning and vital records training sessions in each NARA region. |
| **Results** | ✔ | We established collaborative relationships with FEMA counterparts in 100 percent of FEMA regions. |
| | ✔ | We conducted courses on vital records and emergency preparedness and response in each of our regions. |

*Discussion*   In response to lessons learned from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, NARA put plans in place to promote the preservation of government records during times of disaster.  We also focused on partnerships with the Council of State Archivists (CoSA), the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and others to meet the challenge for all government records nationwide.  This year we continued to foster relationships that will enable us to manage and preserve Federal records in times of disaster.

In FY 2007, a draft of the National Response Framework Emergency Support Function #11 recognized records as natural and cultural resources and historic properties (NCH) resources.  Now in final form, this framework defines NARA's role to provide preservation, scientific/technical, archival and records management advice, and information to help secure and prevent or minimize loss following a disaster of government records and archival materials that define and protect citizen rights and government obligations and document our national experience.  During FY 2009, we participated in regional intergovernmental COOP working groups and continued to establish partnerships with Federal agency officials nationwide through Federal Executive Boards.  Around the country we worked with groups such as the Heritage Emergency National Task Force to promote disaster and emergency response for archives and cultural institutions in Atlanta, GA; we delivered vital records presentations; and attended training sessions addressing emergency response and disaster preparedness.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of FEMA regions in which we have established a supportive partnership* | — | — | *50* | *80* | *100* |

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *in the national response to emergencies.* | | | | | |
| Percent of FEMA regions in which we have established a supportive partnership in the national response to emergencies. | – | – | 60 | 80 | 100 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   While our work to promote the preservation of government records will continue, we have successfully accomplished our objective and this work will no longer be tracked at a strategic level.

## *Strategic Goal 2: Preserve and Process*

### *We will preserve and process records to ensure access by the public as soon as legally possible*

| | |
|---|---|
| **Long-Range Performance Targets** | 2.1  By 2016, 85 percent of scheduled transfers of archival records are received at the scheduled time. |
| | 2.2  By 2016, 95 percent of archival holdings have been processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them. |
| | 2.3  By 2012, 90 percent of agency declassification reviews receive high scores as assessed by the Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO). |
| | 2.4  By 2016, NARA archival holdings of 25-year-old or older records are declassified, exempted, or referred under the provisions of Executive Order 12958, as amended. |
| | 2.5  By 2016, 100 percent of archival holdings are stored in appropriate space. |
| | 2.6  By 2009, 100 percent of NARA records center holdings are stored in appropriate space. |
| | 2.7  By 2016, less than 50 percent of archival holdings require preservation action. |

**FY 2009 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:** $213,766,000; 700 FTE

2.1 ACCESSIONING RECORDS

| | |
|---|---|
| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑  Identify and schedule 10 percent more Federal agency electronic records series or systems than were scheduled in FY 2008. |
| | ☑  20 percent of archival records transfers arrive at NARA on time. |
| | ☐  Establish baseline of records schedules submitted using ERA. |
| **Results** | ✔  We scheduled 60 percent more Federal agency electronic records series or systems, with a focus on CFO Act agencies, than were scheduled in the previous fiscal year. |
| | ✔  We received 21 percent of archival records transfers from targeted agencies. |

✓ We trained staff from our four ERA pilot
agencies to electronically draft schedules
through ERA's records scheduling module.

*Discussion*   Our commitment to ensuring access to the records of our nation depends
heavily on getting the records transferred to NARA on schedule.  Without the proper
identification, schedule, disposition, and transfer of these important records to the
National Archives, the Federal Government becomes susceptible to preventable risks.
During this fiscal year, we continued the momentum to work with agencies to schedule
and transfer their archival records.   We focused our appraisal staff on assisting agencies
with scheduling their electronic records for the impending September 2009 deadline of
complying with section 207(e) of the E-Government Act of 2002.

The success we noted in this area is evidence that our efforts have been somewhat
effective.  This year we exceeded our goal to increase by 10 percent the number of
Federal agency electronic records series or systems scheduled.  We targeted CFO Act
agencies and other selected agencies and surpassed our goal on the percent of archival
records transfers arriving at NARA on time.  We were often limited in evaluating the
timeliness of a transfer (e.g., based on a specific date), but of those targeted agencies
whose records were expected in FY 2009, we achieved a 21 percent success rate.

Part of the strategy for improving customer satisfaction in the processes by which
Federal records are identified, appraised, scheduled, and tracked while in agency
custody is the Electronic Records Archives (ERA), the tool that supports the scheduling
and accessioning of Federal records.  We began a pilot with four agencies for ERA's
initial operating capability deployment in FY 2008.  However, in FY 2009, the number of
schedules submitted through ERA was inadequate to establish a baseline.  We plan to
increase the number of agencies using ERA to schedule their records over the next two
years.

| Performance Data | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of scheduled transfers of archival records transferred to NARA at the scheduled time.* | – | – | – | *20* |
| Percent of archival records transferred to NARA at the scheduled time. | – | – | – | 21 |
| Percent of archival traditional records transferred to NARA at the scheduled time. | – | – | – | 6 |
| Percent of archival electronic records transfers arriving at NARA on time. | – | – | 40 | 44 |
| *Performance target for percent increase in number of Federal agency electronic records series or systems scheduled than prior year.* | – | *10* | *10* | *10* |
| Percent increase in number of Federal agency electronic records series or systems scheduled than prior year. | 10 | 33 | 31 | 60 |
| Number of Federal agency electronic records series or systems scheduled. | – | – | 496 | 794 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   We will continue working to improve the timeliness
of records transfers to NARA.   We plan to develop new strategies and approaches to
increase awareness of scheduling in agencies.

2.2  PROCESSING RECORDS

| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | Increase by 10 points the percent of archival holdings processed to where researchers can have efficient access to them. |
|---|---|---|
| **Results** | ✔ | We increased by 11 points the percent of archival holdings processed to where researchers can have efficient access to them. |

*Discussion*   Archival processing involves all the steps needed to open a record to the public. It includes establishing basic intellectual control, flagging records that have privacy or national security classifications, providing enhanced descriptions of the records content as well as the context in which the records were created, and performing initial preservation so that we can serve the records to the public.

Although we exceeded this year's target to increase processed archival holdings available for access to researchers by 11 percentage points, keeping up with new accessions while addressing the backlog will continue to be a challenge.  We have streamlined our business processes to process holdings more efficiently, and adjusted resources to support this initiative; however, we will continue to confront challenges in meeting our processing targets.

Processing Presidential records is central to the operations of Presidential Libraries and key to making Presidential records available to the public.  With the combined requirements of the Presidential Records Act, the Freedom of Information Act and applicable Executive Orders, the archival processes for Presidential records vary significantly from the processes used to make Federal records available to the public. Within our Presidential Library system, responding to FOIA requests has been the primary mode for processing Presidential records.  Various complexities, such as multiple reviews to ensure the nondisclosure of personal privacy information, affect the efficiency of processing electronic records.  We have implemented several steps to streamline the review process and reduce FOIA backlogs to simplify electronic records processing.

In FY 2009, we received funding for 15 new archivists in our Presidential Libraries.  Once trained, these staff will help to improve both FOIA and systematic processing and open an increasing number of records to researchers.

| **Performance Data** | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percentage point increase in the number of archival holdings that have been processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them.* | — | — | *Establish baseline* | *10* | *10* |
| Percentage point increase in the number of archival holdings processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them. | — | — | — | *Establish baseline* | 11 |
| Percent of archival holdings processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them. | — | — | 21* | 30 | 41 |

*\* Data reported in 2007 reflects only Washington, DC, area work.  Data beginning in 2008 reflects results for the agency.*

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   We will continue to assess how changes in processing operations and increased staffing improve processing productivity.  In our Presidential Libraries, we will train new staff in FOIA and systematic processing.

2.3 GOVERNMENT-WIDE DECLASSIFICATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | Perform annual assessments of agencies with substantial declassification review activity. |
| | ☑ | Increase the percentage of agency declassification reviews receiving high scores as assessed by ISOO. |
| | ☑ | Develop recommendations for declassification programs to improve the quality of their reviews |
| | ☑ | Develop policy guidance for the Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) Framework. |
| **Results** | ✔ | We conducted 19 assessments of agency declassification review programs at Executive branch agencies. |
| | ✔ | Our assessment of agency declassification review programs identified 53 percent of agencies receiving a high score. |
| | ✔ | We issued 16 ISOO notices with 9 notices issued specifically to address the most serious common deficiencies and best practices in agency declassification programs. |
| | ✔ | We developed policy guidance supporting the implementation and transition to the CUI Framework. |

*Discussion*  The Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO), administered by NARA, oversees the Executive branch-wide security classification program under Executive Order 12958, as amended, "Classified National Security Information."  ISOO's oversight includes assessing agency actions to properly declassify, exempt, exclude, refer, or delay specific records under the automatic declassification provisions of the Executive Order 12958, as amended.

Based on lessons learned or common issues identified in agency assessments, ISOO issues guidance to agencies.  ISOO issued nine notices on declassification that addressed the most serious common deficiencies and other more general topics.  The notices assist agencies in training their personnel and provide consistency in the declassification referral process.

In FY 2008, ISOO incorporated assessments of agency declassification review programs as a core function of its oversight responsibilities.  The assessments revealed substantial issues across the Executive branch agencies.  To expand coverage of the program in FY 2009, we trained additional analysts to evaluate declassification programs of Executive agencies. ISOO conducted 19 declassification program assessments and noticed

important improvements, confirming that agencies are taking our advice and using the guidance to improve their programs.

We recognize, as do many agencies, the benefits of the assessments. Several agencies requested detailed results of the initial declassification reviews in an effort to understand and correct deficiencies in their programs or highlight successes to their senior management and customers.

In FY 2008, NARA was designated by Presidential Memorandum as the Executive Agent responsible for implementation of the Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) Framework. To fulfill the responsibilities, we established a CUI Office within ISOO. Through interactions with the CUI Council and interagency working groups, which also include private industry and state and local government stakeholders, the CUI Office developed guidance designed to facilitate the transition to the CUI Framework.

In FY 2009, our CUI Office developed policy guidance concerning: dispute resolution, safeguarding, marking, designation, dissemination, and life cycle. We implemented an outreach strategy to communicate policy updates and progress on the CUI Framework, address CUI concerns, and create formal and informal methods to communicate with stakeholders. We extended our outreach to representatives from State and local law enforcement entities as well as public interest groups for feedback on our CUI guidance development effort and future developments. We planned for a CUI Registry—an online source of guidance and marking information for users of the CUI Framework. We defined requirements for a CUI online training program for all users of CUI.

A Presidential memorandum was issued in FY 2009 establishing a Presidential Task Force to examine CUI and make recommendations to the President concerning CUI policy. As work continues into FY 2010, the results of the task force will likely bring new priorities and directions regarding CUI.

| **Performance Data** | **2005** | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percentage point increase in the number of agency declassification reviews that receive high scores as assessed by ISOO.* | – | | – | *Establish baseline* | *15* |
| Percentage point increase in the number of agency reviews that receive high scores as assessed by ISOO. | – | – | – | – | 17 |
| Percent of agency declassification reviews that receive high scores as assessed by ISOO. | – | – | – | 36 | 53 |
| Number of agency declassification reviews that receive high scores as assessed by ISOO. | – | – | – | 8 | 10 |
| Number of agency declassification reviews assessed by ISOO. | – | – | – | 22 | 19 |
| Number of pages declassified government-wide (in millions of pages). | 24.6 | 34.8 | 34.4 | 27.9 | TBD |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation* ISOO will continue to issue formal notifications that seek to improve the classified national security information program by disseminating consistent guidance to agencies on a periodic basis. We will review agency declassification programs and recommend ways to improve the quality of reviews. We will continue efforts to implement the CUI Framework and respond to any new changes in policy.

2.4 NARA DECLASSIFICATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | Increase by 10 percent the number of pages completed in the National Declassification Initiative (NDI) process. |
| | ☑ | Scan 500,000 pages of Presidential records eligible for declassification review as part of the Remote Archives Capture Project. |
| **Results** | ✓ | We increased by more than 150 percent the number of pages completed in the NDI process. |
| | ✓ | We focused our efforts on the Reagan Presidential Library and scanned 544,631 pages of Presidential records. |

*Discussion*   Executive Order 12958, as amended, directs agencies to review and resolve their equities in security classified documents more than 25 years old that have been referred to them by other agencies.  Working with agencies, we established the National Declassification Initiative (NDI) to provide a systematic approach to the referral of classified equities between Executive branch entities, with the ultimate goal of transparency and proper access.  NARA chairs this group of interagency personnel that performs a quality assurance function to ensure that classified information is not released to the public.  NARA prioritizes the order in which referrals are processed to ensure timely attention to records with high research interest.  This year, we more than doubled our goal of the number of pages completed in the NDI process.  These records receive a quality control review from the Department of Energy before release.   This year, we declassified nearly 12 million pages and moved them to the open shelves.

The success of the National Declassification Initiative (NDI) is dependent on collaboration between NARA and the Federal agencies that constitute the declassification community. To improve our processes and operate more efficiently, we revised our NDI quality assurance team's standard operating procedures that document a modified approach to sampling.   These procedures, once implemented, will greatly increase the amount of records that pass through the quality assurance review team to the processing teams.

For classified materials in the Presidential Library system, we continued our partnership with the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) called the Remote Archives Capture (RAC) project.  We use this vehicle to facilitate declassification review.  Classified materials held by the Presidential Libraries throughout the country are scanned and captured in digital format for review in a centralized location in Washington.  The primary classifying agency uses a classified review system for review and declassification of their equities. The equity declassification review is transmitted to a CIA center.  The CIA center subsequently provides the Library with its declassification decisions.  We successfully scanned 544,631 pages of Presidential records eligible for declassification, exceeding our goal of 500,000 pages.

| **Performance Data** | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Backlog of pages of Federal records eligible for declassification at start of year (in thousands of pages). | – | – | – | 420,050 | 417,098 |

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Backlog of pages of Presidential materials at start of year (in thousands of pages). | 668 | 218 | 218 | 218 | 127 |
| Annual number of Federal pages* declassified (in thousands). | 35 | 89 | 374 | 260 | 11,720 |
| Annual number of Presidential pages* declassified (in thousands). | 94 | 89 | 194 | 80 | 198 |
| *Performance target for percentage point increase in the number of pages completed in the National Declassification Initiative (NDI) process.* | – | – | – | – | *10* |
| Percent increase in the number of pages completed in the NDI process. | – | – | – | – | 150 |
| Number of pages completed in the NDI process (in thousands). | – | – | – | – | 5,566 |
| *Performance target for annual number of Presidential pages scanned (in thousands).* | *300* | *500* | *500* | *500* | *500* |
| Annual number of Presidential pages scanned (in thousands). | 563 | 506 | 512 | 519 | 545 |

*Statistics prior to FY 2008 represent the pages NARA reviewed that are more than 25 years old for which NARA has declassification authority.  This is a subset of overall NARA declassification work.  Statistics for FY 2008 and beyond represent overall NARA declassification work.*

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   Access and use of agency personnel resources within the declassification community to assist with quality assurance, reduction of the classified records backlog, and guidance development will continue to challenge our efforts.  Agency cooperation is essential in identifying records subject to the various declassification deadlines set in E.O. 12958, as amended, as well as helping us resolve impediments in meeting these deadlines.  We will continue scanning pages of Presidential records eligible for declassification review.  NARA plans to establish the National Declassification Center (NDC) when directed.

2.5  ARCHIVAL HOLDINGS IN APPROPRIATE SPACE

**FY 2009 Objectives**         ☑   Complete design for Roosevelt Library renovation.

☐   Award construction contract for first phase of Roosevelt Library renovation.

☑   Complete site work contract for Kennedy Library expansion.

☑   Complete sprinkler upgrades and award construction for mechanical improvements at Eisenhower Library.

☐   Award construction contract and complete mechanical improvements at Carter Library.

☐   Complete design of 1571 improvements for Waltham, San Bruno, and Seattle.

☐   Complete site flood prevention measures at the National Archives Building.

&#9633;   Break ground on new National Personnel Records Center facility.

**Results**

&#10004;   We completed the design for the first phase of a three phase effort to renovate the Roosevelt Library.

&#10004;   We postponed construction contract award to perform additional archeological investigations of the Roosevelt Library site.

&#10004;   We awarded the contract for the Kennedy Library expansion site work.

&#10004;   We completed the sprinkler upgrades at the Eisenhower Library and awarded a construction contract for HVAC improvements.

&#10004;   We awarded a construction contract for mechanical equipment and completed a substantial portion of the construction prior to the museum reopening at the Carter Library.

&#10004;   We completed design work for facility upgrades in San Bruno and Waltham to meet NARA's archival storage standards.

&#10004;   We completed an environmental assessment and completed a substantial portion of the flood gate installation as part of the flood prevention measures at the National Archives Building in Washington, DC.

&#10004;   We reviewed and approved a site design concept for the construction of our new National Personnel Records Center (NPRC), a GSA-leased facility to house archival and permanent holdings.

*Discussion:* NARA has an inventory of 16 NARA-owned buildings—the National Archives Building, the National Archives at College Park, 13 Presidential Libraries and Museums, and the Southwest Regional Archives outside of Atlanta. The National Archives Building and the Roosevelt Library are on the National Register of Historic Places, and all of the Presidential Libraries are considered by the State Historic Preservation Officers to be eligible. All of these buildings are archival storage facilities and house historically valuable and irreplaceable documents.

In 2006, NARA experienced a damaging flood at the National Archives Building in Washington, DC. Damage occurred in the moat, the sub-basement, and some parts of the

basement level, as well as in the William McGowan Theater. We conducted an engineering study into the causes of the flood and proposed mitigation measures. Based on the study, we selected two flood mitigation measures to prevent damage from future floods. We completed the first measure, in 2008, to install cofferdams and watertight doors on the moat electrical vaults last year. In FY 2009, we installed floodgates at the moat entrances and expect to complete implementation of flood prevention measures at the National Archives Building in early FY 2010.

Over the years, the Kennedy Library has received voluminous amounts of accessioned materials that currently exceed the capacity of the Library. The storage areas are overcrowded and do not meet standards for storage of archival material. As an interim solution, we use off-site storage for some of the materials; however, to solve the problem, we need to expand the Library and implement improvements to meet archival storage standards. This year, we awarded the contract for site work construction and have begun site work construction needed for an expansion to the John F. Kennedy Library.

The Roosevelt Library requires renovation to not only correct deficiencies in the building but also bring the facility into compliance with the current NARA standards for preservation and to improve the fire-safety protection of the facility. In addition to upgrading the facility, the renovation design will incorporate a new permanent exhibit. The renovations to this facility will be completed in three phases. Phase 1 includes all site work and renovations to the second level, Phase 2 includes renovations to the main (museum) level, and the last phase will include renovations to the lower level. We completed the design for the first phase; however, we are behind schedule to issue a request for proposal and award the construction contract for site work. The delays result from reviews of the renovation site on archeological issues taking longer than expected to resolve.

Renovations to the Carter Library are also necessary to meet archival preservation standards and replace aging equipment. We awarded a construction contract for the early procurement of mechanical equipment and successfully completed a substantial portion of the original HVAC renovation work to the Library prior to the museum reopening. However, a late change order to replace additional equipment delayed completion of construction to early FY 2010.

NARA's Capital Improvements Plan addressed several facility repairs and renovation activities needed in FY 2009. We are at varying stages of completing these upgrades at our regional facilities. We completed upgrades at San Bruno to comply with archival storage standards; however, we identified issues and have informed GSA of required corrections. As we move forward to comply with archival storage standards, we awarded a construction contract to make improvements to the Waltham facility. We experienced delays as a result of a GSA amended design scope for the Seattle facility. We expect completion of the design in FY 2010.

We opened a new National Archives-Central Plains Region facility in FY 2009. We relocated documents chronicling 170 years of Great Plains life from the Bannister Federal Complex to this new regional facility located in Kansas City, MO. This regional facility will house archival records most frequently requested in the Central Plains region.

The National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) is the largest NARA operation outside the Washington, DC, area with more than four million cubic feet of records. Our facilities—the Military Personnel Records (MPR), the Civilian Personnel Records (CPR), and the Dielman Archival Annex—are plagued with numerous problems and the costs are too high to renovate to comply with archival storage standards. We are working with

GSA to build a new, fully compliant NPRC building that will house more than two million cubic feet of records. We expect to break ground for the new NPRC in FY 2010.

During FY 2009, our Space and Security Management Division, jointly with our Cognizant Security Agency (CSA), conducted physical surveys or inspections of several classified National Security Information storage facilities located at various NARA sites. They also assisted NARA staff offices with preparation of supporting documentation, leading to certification and accreditation (C&A) of these facilities by the CSA. Among those receiving C&A were the George W. Bush Presidential Library temporary facility, the Clinton, Ford, and Reagan Presidential Libraries, and NARA's alternate COOP facilities in West Virginia. NAS also conducted surveys jointly with the CSA, and assisted with the preparation of supporting documentation, for other classified NARA facilities scheduled for C&A during the upcoming fiscal year. These include the Nixon Presidential Library, the Seattle Federal Records Center, and 11 separate areas within the National Archives facility in College Park. There were no hindrances found to getting accreditations and certifications.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of NARA archival traditional holdings in appropriate space. | 53 | 57 | 80 | 81 | 82 |
| Number of archival traditional holdings (in thousands of cubic feet). | 3,164 | 3,296 | 3,346 | 3,729 | 3,979 |
| Percent of artifact holdings in appropriate space. | 42 | 42 | 42 | 40 | 37 |
| Number of artifact holdings (in thousands). | 544 | 544 | 544 | 582 | 628 |
| Percent of electronic holdings in appropriate space. | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Number of electronic holdings in appropriate space (in millions of logical data records). | 4,041 | 4,611 | 4,737 | 5,523 | 6,704 |
| *Performance target for cost of compliant archival storage space per cubic foot of traditional holdings stored (adjusted for inflation).* | – | – | *$5.78* | *$5.84* | *$6.06* |
| Cost of archival storage space per cubic feet of traditional holdings stored. | $6.48 | $6.65 | $6.20 | $5.85 | $5.78 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will continue to focus on maintaining storage facilities that meet archival requirements while keeping costs for archival storage as low as possible. We will complete various stages of renovation activities for the National Archives Building, and the Roosevelt, Nixon, Eisenhower, and Johnson Presidential Libraries, to improve services to researchers and the public.

2.6 NARA FEDERAL RECORDS CENTER HOLDINGS IN APPROPRIATE SPACE

**FY 2009 Objectives**
- ☐ 100 percent of NARA records center holdings are stored in 36 CFR 1228 subpart K compliant space, as certified by NAS.

- ☐ Complete certification of remaining records center facilities that have been brought up to storage standards.

- ☑ Complete construction of National Personnel Records Center Annex.

☑ Move 80 percent of holdings slated for National Personnel Records Center Annex.

**Results**

✔ We completed upgrades in Lenexa and Lee's Summit to meet Federal regulatory standard, 36 CFR 1228 subpart K, for our records center holdings.

✔ We certified NARA compliance with 36 CFR 1228 subpart K for our Lenexa and Lee's Summit records center facilities.

✔ We completed construction of the National Personnel Records Center Annex with six out of the eight bays fully constructed and available.

✔ We moved more than 80 percent of our records from the Civilian Personnel Records and Military Personnel Records sites to the National Personnel Records Center Annex.

*Discussion*: We advanced in our effort to ensure that our nationwide network of Federal Records Centers is in compliance with the Code of Federal Regulation Facility Standards for Records Storage Facilities. For several years, we have made extensive efforts to upgrade, and if upgrades are too costly, replace our records storage facilities. We have lease arrangements with the General Services Administration (GSA) to replace aging facilities. In FY 2008, we completed a lease agreement for a National Personnel Records Center Annex to house temporary records from our Military Personnel Records and the Civilian Personnel Records facilities in this underground facility in Valmeyer, IL. This year, we moved more than 1.4 million cubic feet of records into the annex.

Progress on our leased facilities requires coordination with GSA, who is responsible for contracting and, in some cases, funding the required work. To expedite upgrades in Suitland, MD, we formally requested delegation authority from GSA to contract the compliance work for our Washington National Records Center facility. GSA granted authority and we began design work needed for compliance. In addition, we identified and corrected problems at both our Lenexa and Lee's Summit sites and certified these facilities as compliant in FY 2009. We expect to complete the remaining upgrades to our facilities in FY 2010, with the opening for the new National Personnel Records Center facility in St. Louis in FY 2011.

| **Performance Data** | **2005** | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of NARA records center holdings stored in appropriate space.* | | | | | *100* |
| Percent of NARA records center holdings stored in appropriate space. | — | — | — | — | TBD |
| Percent of NARA records center facilities certified as meeting the 2009 regulatory storage standards. | 9 | 9 | 29 | 33 | 48 |
| Volume of records center holdings (cubic feet in millions). | 24.6 | 25.1 | 25.7 | 26.6 | 27.2 |
| Storage price per cubic foot for records center holdings. | $2.16 | $2.28 | $2.28 | $2.40 | $2.40 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*  Our Federal Records Center Program continues to implement infrastructure upgrades and compliant storage solutions as required for Federal temporary records.  We will complete certification of remaining records centers that have met the storage standards.

2.7  PRESERVATION

**FY 2009 Objectives**

☑ Appropriately treat or house 80,000 cubic feet of NARA's at-risk archival holdings so as to slow further deterioration.

☑ Establish measures for the quantity of dynamic media record holdings that can be preserved using digitization.

☐ Develop plan for conversion of dynamic media records holdings to digital formats by 2016.

☐ Implement infrastructure to ensure preservation of digital products created in preservation reformatting.

☑ Deploy IOC of the Holdings Management System (HMS) for textual records in the National Archives in College Park and provide training to staff.

**Results**

✓ We treated nearly 116,000 cubic feet of at-risk archival records and removed more than 57,000 cubic feet from our preservation backlog.

✓ We developed standardized measures and a database to track measures and preservation needs of at-risk dynamic media records.

✓ We updated the Five-Year Nontextual Preservation Plan and reviewed risks associated with dynamic media records in Classified Special Media projects.

✓ We acquired additional storage capacity for digital products reformatted for preservation purposes.

✓ We deployed IOC of HMS for textual records at the National Archives in College Park and trained staff.

*Discussion:*  We preserve a variety of formats and media in our holdings, from paper records, videotapes, and microfilm, to maps, charts, and artifacts.  We consistently examine our holdings to assess their preservation needs, provide storage conditions that

retard deterioration, and treat, duplicate or reformat records at high risk for loss or deterioration. Our at-risk records include acetate-based still photography and microfilm, audio recordings that require obsolete equipment, videos, brittle and damaged paper records, and motion pictures. We annually set goals to treat and reduce the number of at-risk archival holdings from our preservation backlog and make them available to the public.

Large accessions with high volumes of at-risk records, such as the accession of Official Military and Personnel Files in FY 2009; increased demand for the digitization of records; or high public interest to use at-risk records are a few of the factors that influence the rate in which we perform holdings maintenance and preservation treatment on at-risk records. This year we were able to treat nearly 116,000 cubic feet of at-risk holdings and removed more than 57,000 cubic feet from our preservation backlog.

Other compelling reasons drive our decision-making process in managing at-risk records. The replacement of analog media and equipment to digital counterparts is the impetus behind our need to migrate to newer technologies. In FY 2007 and FY 2008, we purchased much of the equipment needed to convert dynamic media from analog to digital. We continue to train staff in the operation of the equipment and align our workflows to facilitate use of the newer technologies. In addition, we developed and implemented an at-risk database to track progress in the identification and implementation of preservation requirements for dynamic media. This database will help us monitor and understand the production capabilities of our digitization laboratories.

We deployed the initial operating capability of our Holdings Management System (HMS) at the National Archives in College Park for textual records. We developed this system to address long-standing issues and inefficiencies that we experience with storage and management of hardcopy archival holdings. HMS provides a common, integrated solution that when fully deployed, will provide greater physical control over non-electronic archival holdings across all NARA facilities. HMS will provide location and space management for records stored at multiple NARA facilities. We will use this system to quickly locate available space to store records. In addition, the system will include circulation management for tracking the circulation of records to various users; preservation management for effectively managing preservation data, such as risk levels, condition assessments, and the history of preservation actions; inventory management of traditional holdings; and archival project management to track archival processing activities related to the preparation of materials for public access. We remain diligent in our efforts to effectively process and manage our holdings so they are available and accessible to the public for years to come.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of archival holdings that require preservation action.* | – | – | *Establish Baseline* | *≤65* | *≤65* |
| Percent of archival holdings that require preservation action. | – | – | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| Backlog of holdings requiring preservation action (in thousands of cubic feet). | – | 2,182 | 2,165 | 2,418 | 2,581 |
| At-risk archival holdings that received preservation treatment this year (thousands of cubic feet). | 27 | 28 | 54 | 99 | 57 |
| Cumulative volume of at-risk archival holdings in cold storage (thousands of cubic feet). | 86 | 90 | 90 | 91 | 93 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will continue to treat our at-risk records to prevent loss of historically, valuable information. We will launch HMS at the National Archives Building in Washington, DC, and at two regional archives.

## *Strategic Goal 3: Electronic Records*

*We will address the challenges of electronic records in Government to ensure success in fulfilling NARA's mission in the digital era*

| Long-Range Performance Targets | 3.1 By 2016, 95 percent of archival electronic holdings have been processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them. |
|---|---|
| | 3.2 By 2012, 80 percent of archival electronic records are preserved at the planned level of service. |
| | 3.3 By 2016, the per-megabyte cost of managing electronic records decreases each year. |

**FY 2009 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:** $76,860,000; 101 FTE

3.1 PROCESSING ELECTRONIC RECORDS

| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | Sustain 80 percent of archival electronic holdings processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them. |
|---|---|---|
| | ☐ | Complete 75 percent of data migration of holdings from legacy systems migrating to the initial ERA system for Federal records. |
| **Results** | ✓ | We processed and described 88 percent of archival electronic holdings in our legal custody to the point where researchers have efficient access to them. |
| | ✓ | We migrated 60 percent of legacy accessions planned for the initial ERA system. |

*Discussion*   We continue to increase the percent of electronic holdings processed, described, and made available to researchers.   As the Federal Government becomes increasingly dependent on technology, we can expect escalating volumes of archival electronic records accessioned to NARA for preservation and access.  We anticipate near term transfers and accessions of electronic holdings from agencies such as the Census Bureau and the Department of Defense to include hundreds of terabytes of data.

We are addressing this growing volume of electronic records through our implementation of the Electronic Records Archives (ERA).  We identified an initial set of legacy electronic holdings to be ingested in ERA and migrated 60 percent of those electronic holdings in the system.  The legacy migration workflow is a multi-step process that validates and packages accessions before they are ingested into ERA.  Checkpoints throughout the process enable staff to ensure that records maintain their authenticity.  A new release of ERA currently in testing will improve this process.  During FY 2009, we successfully ingested legacy accessions from the Bureau of the Census, the Department of

Energy, and the Office of Education, to name a few. We were able to verify the integrity of the transfer process through ERA.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of archival electronic accessions processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them.* | *80* | *80* | *95* | *80* | *80* |
| Percent of archival electronic accessions processed. | 80 | 80 | 81 | 86 | 88 |
| Number of accessions received. | 1,830 | 2,010 | 2,153 | 2,328 | 2,476 |
| Number of accessions processed. | 1,463 | 1,615 | 1,738 | 2,004 | 2,188 |
| Unprocessed accessioning backlog (in accessions). | 367 | 395 | 415 | 324 | 288 |
| Median time (in calendar days) from the transfer of archival electronic records to NARA until they are available for access. | 413 | 259 | 467 | 2,127* | 1,842* |

*\*Processing completed for numerous electronic record holdings received more than 5 years ago.*

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   We will continue the migration of data from the legacy media to ERA. In addition, we will strive to process new transfers of electronic records using both ERA and our legacy processes for transfers not eligible for ERA processing.

3.2 <u>PRESERVING ELECTRONIC RECORDS</u>

| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☐ | Establish baseline of archival electronic records preserved and managed in a persistent format. |
|---|---|---|
| **Results** | ✓ | We implemented a process to ingest and manage Executive Office of the President electronic records that have been transformed to persistent formats. |

*Discussion*   We drafted a NARA Preservation Conceptual Framework document that describes how NARA will interpret key preservation concepts, such as authenticity, and how ERA will manage its digital assets. We supplemented this information with documents addressing concepts such as transformations, where we examine transforming digital files from one format to another for preservation purposes. Addressing these concepts is necessary as we begin to build a preservation framework in ERA.

In addition, we reviewed the file formats in our holdings to determine the extent of file formats that we manage. We implemented an "adaptation" process for Executive Office of the President (EOP) records to ingest and manage electronic records that have been adapted from their native formats to more persistent formats as the basis for long term preservation.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target of percent of NARA's electronic holdings stabilized.* | – | – | *80* | *80* | *85* |
| Percent of NARA's electronic holdings stabilized. | 89 | 89 | 89 | 90 | 88 |
| Number of accessions received. | 1,830 | 2,010 | 2,153 | 2,328 | 2,476 |
| Number of accessions stabilized. | 1,628 | 1,788 | 1,915 | 2,097 | 2,186 |

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cumulative number of archival holdings accessioned (in millions of logical data records). | 4,041 | 4,611 | 4,737 | 5,523 | 6,704 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will define the criteria and policy for establishing planned levels of service to preserve and make available archival electronic records.

3.3 COST OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS MANAGEMENT

**FY 2009 Objectives**
☑ Achieve initial operating capability of the ERA system for Presidential records.

☐ Extend ERA to additional agencies beyond the pilot agencies.

☑ Initiate design and development of ERA capabilities for public access and long-term preservation.

**Results**
✓ We deployed an ERA instance for Presidential records and ingested and stored electronic records transferred from the White House at the end of the George W. Bush Administration.

✓ We analyzed feedback from our pilot agencies to prepare for extension of ERA to additional agencies.

✓ We developed high-level requirements for public access search capability. We developed an initial preservation framework based on existing formats in our holdings.

*Discussion* We met the challenge of transferring the George W. Bush Presidential records with the deployment of the Executive Office of the President (EOP) instance of our ERA system in December 2008. This modified version of ERA incorporated requirements unique to Presidential records. We were able to successfully ingest the unclassified Presidential electronic records of the George W. Bush Administration into ERA. A small volume of classified and Federal records were secured in standalone systems until they can be brought into ERA. We were challenged with managing a substantially higher volume of electronic records than the combined total of all previous collections of electronic Presidential records. More than 77 terabytes have been ingested to date.

During the process, ERA ingested files adapted to formats designed to make them accessible on whatever hardware or software is currently in use. The ERA EOP release provided NARA with the capability to ingest more than 40 times the volume of data in less than half the time it took for the approach we used to ingest the Clinton data. The release also supported search and access capability across the varied types of files and data received from standalone EOP systems.

We performed an initial pilot of the scheduling, accessioning, and electronic records transfer functions of ERA with the support of five Federal agencies.   Based on their input during the pilot, we are refining ERA in preparation for use of the system by additional Federal agencies.

We explored specific technologies to incorporate in ERA to address online public access and preservation requirements.  We began design work for an online public access instance and preservation framework.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for megabyte cost to manage archival electronic records.* | – | – | – | – | *Establish baseline* |
| Per megabyte cost to manage archival electronic records. | $0.70 | $0.43 | $0.37 | $0.39 | $0.36 |
| Number of megabytes of archival electronic records stabilized (in millions). | 9.5 | 16.8 | 17.8 | 18.2 | 19.2 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   We will design and deploy public access capabilities.   We will extend ERA to agencies beyond those included in the initial release.

## *Strategic Goal 4: Access*

### *We will provide prompt, easy, and secure access to our holdings anywhere, anytime*

| | |
|---|---|
| **Long-Range Performance Targets** | 4.1. By 2016, NARA customer service standards for researchers are met or exceeded. |
| | 4.2. By 2012, 1 percent of archival holdings are available online. |
| | 4.3. By 2016, 95 percent of archival holdings are described at the series level in an online catalog. |
| | 4.4. By 2012, our web sites score at or above the benchmark for excellence as defined for Federal Government web sites. |

**FY 2009 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:** $50,412,000; 274 FTE

4.1  NARA CUSTOMER SERVICE STANDARDS

| | |
|---|---|
| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ 92 percent of written requests are answered within 10 working days; |
| | ☑ 93 percent of items requested in our research rooms are furnished within 1 hour of request or scheduled pull time; |
| | ☐ 87 percent of Freedom of Information Act requests for Federal records are answered within 20 working days; |
| | ☑ 90 percent of online archival fixed-fee reproduction orders are completed in 20 working days or less. |
| **Results** | ✔ We answered 95 percent of written requests within 10 working days. |
| *"Thank you very much for copies of my mother's and grandfather's letters to Mr. Hoover."* | ✔ We provided 93 percent of items requested in our research room within 1 hour of request or scheduled pull time. |
| *"Thanks to you and the Library for keeping these documents safe, and making them readily accessible."* | ✔ We answered 86 percent of Freedom of Information Act requests for Federal records within 20 working days. |
| | ✔ We completed 90 percent of our online archival fixed-fee reproduction orders in 20 working days or less. |

*Discussion*   We successfully met or exceeded most of our customer service targets in FY 2009, however, we fell slightly short of meeting our target for processing Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests in 20 working days or less.  We experienced a 20 percent increase in the number of FOIA requests, with the heaviest volume in the second half of the year.  In our research rooms, our customers received requested research materials within one hour 93 percent of the time; responses to their written requests within 10 working days 95 percent of the time; and online archival reproduction orders within 20 working days 90 percent of the time — a 22-percentage-point increase in the rate completed in FY 2008.  This consistently positive trend reflects our commitment to provide more timely responses to these important requests.

In addition, we initiated efforts to apply "Lean Management" principles and methodologies in our largest research rooms.  We examined current work processes and identified short and long-term efficiencies to improve overall customer service in this area.  In several offices, the development of written standard operating procedures was another method used to improve operations.  Even though the volume of work fluctuated throughout the year, we adjusted available resources and balanced the workload to meet customer service standards.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for written requests answered within 10 working days.* | *95* | *95* | *90* | *91* | *92* |
| Percent of written requests answered within 10 working days. | 96 | 97 | 95 | 94 | 95 |
| *Performance target for Freedom of Information Act requests for Federal records completed within 20 working days.* | *90* | *90* | *85* | *86* | *87* |
| Percent of Freedom of Information Act requests for Federal records completed within 20 working days. | 82 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 86 |
| Number of FOIAs processed (Federal and Presidential). | 8,879 | 8,883 | 12,390 | 13,469 | 17,508 |
| Annual cost to process FOIAs (in millions). | $1.74 | $2.62 | $2.72 | $2.34 | $2.79 |
| Annual per FOIA cost. | $196 | $295 | $220 | $173 | $158 |
| *Performance target for items requested in our research rooms furnished within 1 hour of request or scheduled pull time.* | *95* | *95* | *95* | *90* | *93* |
| Percent of items requested in our research rooms furnished within 1 hour of request or scheduled pull time. | 98 | 96 | 86 | 93 | 93 |
| Number of researcher visits to our research rooms (in thousands). | 171 | 132 | 136 | 140 | 129 |
| Number of items furnished in our research rooms (in thousands). | 537 | 421 | 520 | 576 | 553 |
| Number of items furnished on time in our research rooms (in thousands). | 527 | 405 | 449 | 537 | 515 |
| *Performance target for archival fixed-fee reproduction orders through SOFA are completed in 20 (35 pre-2007) working days or less.* | *80* | *85* | *85* | *85* | *90* |
| Percent of archival fixed-fee reproduction orders through SOFA are completed in 20 (35 pre-2007) working days or less. | 99 | 97 | 72 | 68 | 90 |
| Average per order cost to operate fixed-fee ordering. | $27.31 | $28.74 | $26.67 | $30.59 | $38.06 |
| Average order completion time (days). | 12 | 14 | 17 | 22 | 18 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   We expect to meet or exceed our published standards for customer service.  Our newly established Office of Government

Information Services will begin work to improve FOIA practices government-wide and ensure an open and accessible government.

4.2  ONLINE ACCESS TO ARCHIVAL HOLDINGS

**FY 2009 Objectives**

☐  Meet 20 percent of the 2012 target for archival holdings accessible online.

☐  Increase the volume of use of Access to Archival Databases (AAD) by 10 percent.

☐  Increase the number of visits to ARC by 10 percent.

**Results**

*"It gives many windows to learn about our history, in the palm of my hand.  Thank you."*

✔  We have met the target for our electronic archival records; however, we have less than one percent of NARA's traditional archival holdings accessible online.

✔  We discontinued this measure due to technical issues.

✔  We experienced a six percent decrease in ARC visits over the last year.

*Discussion*   We continue to advance online public access to an increased number of our holdings.  We are examining our agency-wide digitization infrastructure and defining ways to strategically provide and manage online access to our holdings.  Digitizing selected archival holdings presents internal and external benefits  such as reducing the physical handling of original records and providing online access to records for those unable to visit our facilities.

As we continue on our path of making more of our archival holdings accessible online, partnerships with private industry and institutions help to facilitate the digitization process.  We actively engage in partnerships with Footnote, The Generations Network (TGN), and *Familysearch.org* (Genealogical Society of Utah).  In FY 2009, examples of several of our digitization projects include:  1) Footnote partnership to digitize and develop descriptive metadata for various Holocaust Assets Records microfilm publications; 2) TGN partnership to digitize World War II draft registration cards; 3) FamilySearch.org partnership to digitize indexes to naturalization records.

Our Presidential Libraries are also engaged in an array of digitization activities to enhance public access to their holdings.  We have an ongoing partnership with the University of Texas Learning Center and the Johnson Library to continue development and enhancements to the Presidential Timeline web site with the addition of educational modules, and workshops to assist teachers as they implement modules in the classroom.

In our regions this year, we had 15 digitization projects in place to digitize nearly five million images in our facilities throughout the country.   In partnership with The Generations Network (TGN) and *FamilySearch.org*, these projects included the digitization of World War II draft registration cards, varied naturalization records, slave manifests, and Chinese passenger records.

Our Access to Archival Databases (AAD) resource provides online access via the Internet to a selection of NARA's electronic records from archival databases of more than 30 Federal agencies. This year we noticed an unusual surge in the number of queries to the system with an increase of nearly 743 percent. We investigated this dramatic increase and learned that automated programs running from unknown users mimic normal, individually run, queries. We will discontinue reporting this measure.

While the number of visits to ARC has declined slightly this year, our current rate of visits is more than 100 percent above prior year levels. Last year we rolled out a new, simplified search box, which helped boost use. We continue to maintain high levels of customer satisfaction.

In addition, we expanded the breadth of tools available to access our data. Using social media and Web 2.0 technologies, we are implementing ways to meet the user where they are online. With the increased popularity of such Web 2.0 technologies as *YouTube, Facebook*, wikis, and blogs, we reach new audiences and customers that may be unfamiliar with the National Archives.

| **Performance Data** | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of traditional records available online. | – | – | – | .04 | .04 |
| *Performance target for percent increase in number of archival electronic holdings accessible online.* | *20* | *10* | *10* | – | – |
| Percent increase in number of archival electronic holdings accessible online. | 20 | 13 | -24 | 8 | 5 |
| Percent of electronic records available online (logical data records in millions). | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| *Performance target for percent increase in ARC visits.* | – | – | – | *10* | *10* |
| Percent increase in ARC visits. | 81 | -11 | 15 | 131 | -6 |
| Number of ARC visits (in thousands of visits). | 286 | 254 | 291 | 671 | 631 |
| *Performance target for percent increase in AAD use.* | – | – | – | *10* | *10* |
| Use of AAD (in thousands of queries). | 1,134 | 1,480 | 1,665 | 2,086 | – |
| Percent increase in AAD use. | 46 | 31 | 13 | 25 | – |

*Due to technical difficulties in FY 2009, we will no longer report use or query data for AAD.*

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   We will increase the number of archival holdings accessible online, whether through NARA or our partners. We will create digital images of the 1940 Census records and perform technical quality control.

4.3  ONLINE CATALOG

| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | Describe 65 percent of NARA traditional holdings in the Archival Research Catalog (ARC). |
|---|---|---|
| | ☑ | Describe 65 percent of NARA artifact holdings in ARC. |
| | ☑ | Describe 65 percent of NARA electronic holdings in ARC. |
| **Results** | ✓ | We described 69 percent of NARA traditional holdings in ARC. |

✓ We described 74 percent of NARA artifact holdings in ARC.

*"The beauty of the Charters of Freedom – kids are intrigued by seeing the original documents as we study them in class."*

✓ We described 95 percent of NARA electronic holdings in ARC.

*Discussion*   The Archival Research Catalog (ARC) is our online catalog with descriptions of holdings, artifacts, and electronic records in the custody of the National Archives. ARC contains more than three and a half million descriptions and links to more than 152,000 digital images of some of our most sought after holdings.   Our goal is for ARC to be a comprehensive, self-service, online catalog of descriptions of our nationwide holdings.  We are working toward the integration of the public side of ARC with our Electronic Records Archive (ERA) system in late FY 2010.

Each year we try to increase the percentage of holdings that we describe in ARC, enabling the public to search for our records at anytime and anywhere using the Internet. This year, we successfully met our target for each category of holdings that we describe. In addition, we captured data from existing finding aids and included this information in ARC.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for traditional holdings in an online catalog.* | *40* | *50* | *55* | *60* | *65* |
| Percent of traditional holdings in an online catalog. | 43 | 51 | 56 | 64 | 69 |
| Number of traditional holdings described in an online catalog (millions of cubic feet). | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 2.7 |
| Number of traditional holdings in NARA (millions of cubic feet). * | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 4.0 |
| *Performance target for artifact holdings in an online catalog.* | *40* | *50* | *55* | *60* | *65* |
| Percent of artifact holdings in an online catalog. | 43 | 57 | 57 | 61 | 74 |
| Number of artifact holdings described in an online catalog (thousands of items). | 233 | 309 | 309 | 353 | 465 |
| Number of artifact holdings in NARA (thousands of items). | 544 | 544 | 544 | 582 | 628 |
| *Performance target for electronic holdings in an online catalog.* | *10* | *20* | *55* | *60* | *65* |
| Percent of electronic holdings in an online catalog. | 63 | 98 | 99 | 98 | 95 |
| Number of electronic holdings described in an online catalog (billions of logical data records). | 2.5 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 6.4 |
| Number of electronic holdings in NARA (billions of logical data records). | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 5.2 | 6.7 |
| Number of series described in ARC (cumulative). | 18,110 | 31,561 | 49,691 | 74,544 | 102,250 |
| Number of ARC users (in thousands of visits). | 286 | 254 | 291 | 671 | 631 |

*\* The figures for traditional holdings are less than reported in previous years by about 3,600 cubic feet (1/10th of 1 percent) due to the re-allocation of a collection stored at the Library of Congress.*

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   We will continue to expand our online holdings and the percentage of our holdings described in our online catalog.  We will measure our efforts to make archival holdings accessible online in cubic feet.  We will address description challenges presented by the large increase in electronic records from the Bush Administration's transition.  We will begin work to subsume ARC web into ERA.

4.4  ONLINE SERVICES

**FY 2009 Objectives**      ☑  Improve NARA's score against the benchmark for excellence by 1 percentage point.

    ☑  Develop a comprehensive and strategic concept of operations for web-based access to our online assets.

**Results**      ✔  We exceeded the benchmark for excellence by 2 percentage points.

    ✔  We developed high-level requirements and a prototype for online public access design and functionality.

*Discussion*   We continue to collect public feedback about our sites through our American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) online surveys.  We measure satisfaction by customer groups (e.g. genealogists, veterans, educators, students, etc.)  and use this valuable feedback to understand their experience on our websites.  We identify customer-focused strategies to develop, modify, or remove web content to improve customer satisfaction levels.  We apply this benchmark for excellence to our archives.gov web site and compare it against other Federal Government portal sites as a gauge to understand how we compare to other agencies.   Previous analysis of feedback revealed that our site search capability would benefit from improvement.  We enhanced our search engine and noticed an increase in our search score as well as our overall score.  Our overall satisfaction score rose from 66 to 68 percent in FY 2009.  Customer expectations tend to increase as they become aware of or experience new technologies.  When faced with these expectations, increasing our satisfaction levels often proves challenging.

We recently piloted several social media and Web 2.0 applications as new ways to reach our customers.  We launched a *YouTube* channel, *Facebook* pages, and a *blog* to establish a dialog about our public events and holdings with our customers.   We also implemented an *RSS* feed from *archives.gov* where users can subscribe to a daily update of featured documents from our holdings.  Users can view an online photostream through *Flickr,* where we showcase historical photographs and documents from our holdings.  We will assess the impact these new tools have on our customer satisfaction levels as we experiment with their use.

The Presidential Libraries' sites continue to outperform the overall ACSI e-Government satisfaction score and other benchmarks.  We use the ACSI e-Government satisfaction score for the government portal site as a benchmark to evaluate our web sites.  We plan to continue to respond to customer expectations by following this successful model and building upon the success of the collective Presidential Library web sites.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Online visits to NARA's web sites (in thousands). | 21,859 | 31,897 | 34,871 | 37,807 | 37,470 |
| *Performance target in percent improvement in web sites score at or above the benchmark for excellence as defined for Federal government web sites.* | — | — | — | *Establish baseline* | 1 |
| Percentage point improvement in web sites score. | | | | — | 2 |

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Web sites score at or above the benchmark for excellence as defined for Federal government web sites. | 69 | 69 | 67 | 66 | 68 |
| Presidential Libraries score at or above the benchmark for excellence as defined for Federal government web sites. | 75 | 77 | 77 | 75 | 78 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*    We will continue to collect public feedback about our web sites and major application interfaces to guide us as we enhance *archives.gov* to make it more beneficial to our customers.

## *Strategic Goal 5: Civic Literacy*

*We will increase access to our records in ways that further civic literacy in America through our museum, public outreach, and education programs*

| **Long-Range Performance Targets** | 5.1. By 2016, our museums score in the top 10 percent of all history museums nationally according to industry measures. |
|---|---|
| | 5.2 By 2016, 95 percent of exhibit, public outreach, and education visitors are highly satisfied with their visit experience. |

**FY 2009 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:** $23,638,000; 191 FTE

5.1  ACCESS THROUGH MUSEUMS

| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | Analyze data from the American Association of State and Local History Museums (AASLH) study. |
|---|---|---|
| | ☐ | Issue report on NARA's 12 Presidential Library museum programs. |

| **Results** | ✔ | NARA's AASLH study results indicate high levels of overall satisfaction among our museum visitors. |
|---|---|---|
| *"I understand the importance of history more after seeing the documents."* | | |
| *"I spent 20 years protecting this country; I'd gladly do it again after viewing these marvelous documents."* | ✔ | We prepared a report on alternative models for Presidential Libraries in response to a Congressional request. |

*Discussion:*  The National Archives plays a unique and important role in the promotion of civic literacy.  As the keeper of the records of the Government, we have literally safeguarded the documentary record of American history.  This record belongs to the American people.  From the Charters of Freedom, to the census records that enumerate our country's population, to the records of Congress and Presidential Administrations, our holdings are so vast and diverse that the value and amount of information available is not always readily apparent to the public.  We continually educate the public about the treasure trove of information and services we offer.  Museum programs are an inspiring way for people to understand their own personal connection to the records in the National Archives.

Our museums offer a variety of public experiences throughout the United States.  The National Archives Experience, launched in FY 2005 with the opening of the Public Vaults exhibit, the McGowan Theater, and O'Brien Traveling Exhibits Gallery, continues to grow in scope and impact.  Presidential Libraries and museums play a vital role in promoting an understanding of not only the Presidency, but also American history and democracy.  This year we celebrated the 75th anniversary of the National Archives and showcased an exhibit which featured "big records, big documents, and big events."  This exhibit, titled

"*BIG!*," hosted in Washington, DC, and at several of our regional locations, displayed various original documents in full scale.  Anniversary events were held throughout our regional locations.

Our patrons often indicate their increased appreciation of history, the value of the written record and the influence of the past on the present.  We relish the opportunity to advance civic literacy through the many venues that we offer.  In late FY 2007 through FY 2008, using the American Association of State and Local History Museums (AASLH) measurement instrument, we surveyed customers for vital feedback on the museum and museum programs in Washington, DC.  We wanted to gain insight of the degree to which our exhibits have had a meaningful impact on visitors.  The final survey week concluded in early FY 2009 and we compiled the surveys and sent them to AASLH for analysis.  We learned that although our overall customer satisfaction ranked 8.9 on a 10 point scale, for us to reach the top tier of museums, we need to consider improvements to the logistics and content in the Rotunda to enhance customer experiences.

Using technology to deliver our programs, we opened our doors to social media and Web 2.0 technologies.  The public can find the National Archives on *YouTube, Flickr*, and *Facebook* and access a host of information.  By inserting the National Archives in venues where potential customers reside, we have discovered invaluable methods to communicate and interact with our customers to advance civic literacy.

Last year, we initiated a study of 12 of our Presidential Libraries.  The Libraries prepared profiles documenting the status of their programs with an eye toward planning the future direction of the museums.  In FY 2009, we worked to consolidate the input from this study.  We also completed and issued a report requested by Congress to examine alternative models for Presidential Libraries.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of physical visitors to NARA museums, exhibits, research rooms and programs (in millions). | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.9 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   We will incorporate logistical improvements and enhancements to improve the Rotunda experience.  We plan to complete our study of the Presidential Libraries.

5.2  CUSTOMER SATISFACTION WITH OUR PROGRAMS

| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☑ | 95 percent of NARA education, public outreach, and exhibit visitors are highly satisfied with their visit experience. |
|---|---|---|
| | ☐ | Implement Presidential Library education program survey. |
| **Results** | ✔ | More than 97 percent of our visitors (who offered voluntary ratings) were highly satisfied with their visit experience. |
| | ✔ | We drafted an education survey instrument in preparation for submission to OMB for approval. |

*Discussion:* We deliver a wide variety of experiences for visitors throughout the National Archives through physical visits, online, and offline publications, video conferences, web-casts, and most recently, through social media and Web 2.0 applications. Our approach allows us to reach audiences through many different venues and capture feedback on their experience. While studies indicate that visitor satisfaction correlates with learning; we value the opportunity to fulfill and enrich our visitors through our educational programs. This year, 99 percent of our programs were rated as having met attendees' expectations.

In our Office of the Federal Register, we conduct monthly workshops with the public and Federal agency regulation writers to inform attendees about the Federal regulatory process and the role of the *Federal Register*. Our overall goal is to promote a better understanding of the system and increase public participation. The feedback we receive consistently assures us that we have met attendees' expectations.

We conduct numerous teacher workshops throughout the year. Our workshops serve from ten to more than 1,000 attendees, especially when applying technology such as videoconferencing to reach our nationwide audiences. We train Federal employees to recognize and save permanently valuable records of the Federal Government and we offer workshops for archival professionals to enhance their understanding of archival principles. Our customers tell us that programs such as our *Introduction to Genealogy* and *Help,! I'm Stuck* are very helpful to both new and experienced genealogists.

During the year, we expanded our public outreach activities. We initiated an Archival Expert Series in which archival staff share information on archival treasures discovered in the holdings; a noontime film series featuring films from our holdings; and a lecture series featuring authors whose research reflect the holdings of the National Archives.

In the Presidential Libraries, we continued to seize opportunities to advance civic literacy. We continue to host robust museum, education, and public program offerings. In FY 2009, every Presidential Library held a series of national issues forums, community-oriented discussions on pertinent topics such as health care, energy, and the economy. A number of Libraries, including Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, and Ford Libraries sought creative ways to increase teacher awareness through ongoing teacher newsletters that highlight upcoming educational opportunities. New teacher workshops offered by the Libraries include Teaching American History Grant workshops, the Truman Library's Symposium, "*Between the Wars,*" and the Johnson Library's new teacher seminar, which brought together scholars and educators from over seven NARA facilities. We hosted a number of special exhibits including the highly popular "*School House to White House*" exhibit, exhibits on space exploration at the Johnson and Bush Libraries, and "*Treasures of a President*" at the Roosevelt Library.

We began work on an education program survey to measure customer satisfaction. Work on the Presidential transition took priority, but we plan to have the instrument ready for OMB review in FY 2010.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of education, public outreach, and exhibit visitors who are highly satisfied with their visit experience.* | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Percent of education, public outreach, and exhibit visitors who are highly satisfied with their visit. | 96 | 96 | 96 | 97 | 97 |

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of rated education programs, workshops, and training courses. | 547 | 605 | 606 | 632 | 632 |
| Number of attendees at rated education programs, workshops, and training courses. | 9,248 | 10,394 | 10,229 | 11,246 | 11,649 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation* We will develop an education program survey to identify and prioritize ways to enhance teaching programs at the Presidential Libraries. We will implement improvements in the Rotunda based on feedback obtained from the AASLH survey.

### *Strategic Goal 6: Infrastructure*

## *We will equip NARA to meet the changing needs of our customers*

| | |
|---|---|
| **Long-Range Performance Targets** | 6.1. By 2016, 95 percent of employees possess the core competencies that were identified for their jobs. |
| | 6.2. By 2016, the percentages of NARA employees in underrepresented groups match their respective availability levels in the Civilian Labor Force (CLF). |
| | 6.3. By 2016, public network applications are available 99 percent of the time. |

**FY 2009 Resources Available to Meet This Goal:**  $38,287,000; 184 FTE

6.1  RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **FY 2009 Objectives** | ☐ | Maintain 95 percent of staff development plans linked to strategic outcomes. |
| | ☑ | Maintain 95 percent of employee performance plans linked to strategic outcomes. |
| | ☑ | Develop NARA's Strategic Human Capital Plan. |
| **Results** | ✓ | We maintained 67 percent of staff development plans linked to strategic outcomes. |
| | ✓ | We maintained 96 percent of employee performance plans linked to strategic outcomes. |
| | ✓ | We completed our first Strategic Human Capital Plan, a 5-year plan to address the agency's strategic management of human capital. |

*Discussion:*  Annually, we align employee performance plans and staff development plans to our agency's mission and strategic goals.  We recognize the importance of the plans and the value in employees understanding how their work ties either directly or indirectly to the agency's mission, and in large part, to the *NARA Srategic Plan*.  We use our performance plans and staff development plans to document this connection.

Staff use the development plans to identify training requirements, navigate career paths, understand Government operations, or close or narrow skill gaps in core competencies. We document opportunities to network, mentor, cross-train, and shadow both internal and external to our agency.  Our Learning Management System, NARA's online training tool, delivers and tracks training throughout the agency.  This year 96 percent of employee performance plans and 67 percent of NARA's staff development plans linked to strategic outcomes.  Although we strive to meet these goals each year, we experienced a drop in our development plans.  We conducted staff assessments in one of our offices

to determine competencies and identify development requirements. Documenting development requirements in the staff development plans will be an outgrowth of this exercise.

In several offices throughout NARA, we implemented a methodology and process to move organizations toward high performance. Some offices used the model to establish an organizational strategic plan, others used the model to identify and institute process improvement in their offices, and still other offices used the model to re-organize and identify skill deficits within the organization. This model encourages employee development in the areas of leadership, management, and teamwork, and presents ways to operate more effectively and efficiently.

We completed and issued our five-year Strategic Human Capital Plan. This plan provides direction for NARA's most significant workforce management challenges and opportunities. We presented five strategic goals and numerous supporting strategies to describe our plan to recruit, develop and strengthen, and retain our human capital resources to achieve mission success. We developed the plan with input and feedback from program offices, NARA staff, and the union. As we implement various human capital activities, we will monitor performance results and assess our human capital programs, decisions, and actions. We will re-evaluate the plan every five years to ensure continued alignment with the NARA Strategic Plan and assess the current environment to validate that the plan reflects our current state, addresses deficiencies, and reflects our need for an alternative course of action.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of permanent staff having staff development plans that link to strategic outcomes.* | *95* | *95* | *95* | *95* | *95* |
| Percent of permanent staff having staff development plans that link to strategic outcomes. | 77 | 76 | 96 | 88 | 67 |
| Number of permanent staff having staff development plans that link to strategic outcomes. | 2,071 | 1,970 | 2,372 | 2,223 | 1,750 |
| Number of permanent staff. | 2,690 | 2,656 | 2,520 | 2,533 | 2,670 |
| Average time (in calendar days) to fill a leadership position. | 82 | 42 | 39 | 55 | 65 |
| *Performance target for percent of staff having performance plans that link to strategic outcomes.* | *95* | *95* | *95* | *95* | *95* |
| Percent of staff having performance plans that link to strategic outcomes. | 94 | 95 | 97 | 98 | 96 |
| Number of staff having performance plans that link to strategic outcomes. | 2,560 | 2,530 | 2,479 | 2,510 | 2,573 |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation* NARA will develop an accountability system to monitor and evaluate our human capital management policies, practices, and programs.

6.2 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

**FY 2009 Objectives** ☑ Increase the percentage of applicants pools with applicants in underrepresented groups for positions in grades 13 and above over the percentage in FY 2008.

**Results**
      ✓    The diversity in our applicant pools decreased by 15 percent for grades 13 and above.

*Discussion:* NARA strives to achieve a workforce that reflects the demographics of our nation's diverse workforce. We have met this goal for one of our underrepresented groups (i.e. Women, Blacks, Latino-Hispanic, Asian American/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and persons with targeted disabilities); however, we must focus on improving our performance in hiring and promoting people in underrepresented groups by continuing our efforts to expand recruiting techniques, analyze pertinent personnel information, and implement staff development programs.

This year, we continued to experience a low number of applicant pools at the GS 13-15 level. The majority of GS 13-15 applicant pools this year were from announcements targeted to current Federal employees or NARA-only employees. Because neither the Federal workforce, nor the NARA workforce, is as diverse as the civilian labor force, we faced limitations in our ability to attract additional diversity to the NARA workforce. Although we have not achieved steady growth in the applicant pools, we do maintain a diverse workforce across all GS grade levels.

We recognize the need to improve performance in hiring and promoting people in underrepresented groups. Efforts underway to expedite progress include expanded recruitment techniques, collection and analysis of relevant personnel management data, and the implementation of staff development programs. In response to Federal requirements, we outlined numerous strategies in our 2009 Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) to increase the representation of women and minorities at all levels at NARA. Our strategies focus on expanded partnerships with minority-serving universities, education associations, and professional organizations; attendance and networking at minority conferences and job fairs; and facilitating the use of developmental assignments that offer on-the-job training for women and minorities.

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Performance target for percent of applicant pools for positions at grades GS-13 and above that contain people in underrepresented groups.* | *93* | *96* | *87* | *77* | *92* |
| Percent of applicant pools for positions at grades GS-13 and above that contain people in underrepresented groups. | 95 | 87 | 76 | 91 | 77 |
| Number of applicants for positions at grades GS-13 and above. | 1,725 | 677 | 194 | 259 | 148 |
| Number of applicant pools for positions at grades GS-13 and above. | 153 | 86 | 37 | 54 | 30 |
| Number of pools for positions in grades GS-13 and above that had self-identified applicants in protected classes. | 145 | 75 | 28 | 49 | 23 |

| Percent of Civilian Labor Force rate used to determine if underrepresented groups met employment target. | 80 | 90 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Underrepresented groups of employees meeting target (checkmark indicates target met or exceeded)<br>—Women<br>—Black<br>—Latino-Hispanic<br>—Asian American/Pacific Islander<br>—American Indian/Alaskan Native<br>—Targeted disability | ✔<br><br>✔ | ✔<br><br>✔ | ✔<br><br>✔ | ✔<br><br>✔ | ✔ |

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*   Improving performance in hiring and promoting people in underrepresented groups is an ongoing effort to achieve a workforce that mirrors the society that we live in.

6.3  INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

**FY 2009 Objectives**

☑ Public network applications are available 98.84 percent of the time.

☑ Award the NARA IT support services contract.

☑ Determine strategy and develop Concept of Operations for integration and management of remote access for mobile users.

☐ Update network capacity across the enterprise by increasing bandwidth.

☐ Upgrade the telephone infrastructure.

**Results**

✔ Public network applications are available 99.52 percent of the time.

✔ We awarded a multi-year NARA IT support services contract to Capstone Corporation covering IT operations and maintenance support services for NARA.

✔ We drafted a strategy and Concept of Operations for a secure, remote access solution to support access to Federal telework initiatives.

✔ We completed a partial implementation of our high speed network which includes increased bandwidth and enhanced capabilities and support for digitized voice services.

✔ We upgraded our telephone infrastructure to include enhanced features such as 5-digit dialing at all NARA sites and automatic call distribution

for help desk support.

*Discussion:* Every year, we rely more heavily on technology to conduct business with the public, to perform our jobs, and to facilitate communications. Our technological tools are essential resources that we use to communicate with our customers, provide access to digital records and research, and create venues for customers to visit our facilities and experience our exhibits through virtual worlds. The tools offer flexibility and consistency in work processes and operations. NARA hosts several applications that are available to the public through the Internet. These systems support a variety of business applications and must be available to the public at all times. The requirements of both NARA's customers and staff using our public network applications necessitates that these tools remain stable, secure, and continuously available (i.e. 24x7). Often system upgrades or scheduled maintenance require that a system become unavailable; however, we target off-peak times to impact as few as possible. Maintaining this level of efficiency requires monitoring of our resources and services to ensure optimal performance. This year we exceeded our target to ensure availability of public network applications.

In FY 2009, we awarded a new NARA IT and Telecommunications Support Services (NITTSS) contract to establish and sustain efficient management of the NARA IT infrastructure and provide improved IT services. Under this contract we integrated telephone responsibilities with information technology operations to manage these network services and communications as a unified operation. We have implemented improvements such as enhanced support to our Presidential Libraries and full time system administrators at our field offices to strengthen the quality of services supporting NARANET users at our Presidential Libraries and regional locations.

To support Federal telework initiatives, we developed a strategy to integrate and manage remote access for mobile users. We developed a policy for token management and distribution and implemented a solution to provide NARA users with secure access to our internal network from remote locations. We piloted our solution among a representative sample of NARA users before offering secure access to staff eligible to telework in the agency. Using a standard remote access technology, two-factor authentication, our staff can now access the internal network to conduct their work external to NARA facilities.

Many of the IT services that we provide depend on a robust network infrastructure to facilitate optimal performance. This becomes most crucial as we add applications and users to our network and steadily increase the volume of digitized holdings. This year we increased the bandwidth of our network by updating network capacity across the entire enterprise. To reduce network congestion and improve telecommunications and access for remote users, we increased bandwidth at several of our field sites.

| **Performance Data** | **2005** | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percent of public network availability. | 99.9 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| *Performance target for percent availability of public applications.* | *97* | *98.9* | *98.80* | *98.83* | *98.84* |
| Percent of public network applications availability. | 98.9 | 98.9 | 99.4 | 99.5 | 99.5 |
| Number of total hours that any public network application was unavailable. | 923 | 830 | 504 | 424 | 414 |
| Number of uses of public network applications (in millions). | 6.6 | 6.7* | 6.5* | 8.8 | 7.0 |

| Performance Data | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cost per network user for public applications. | $0.24 | $0.24 | $0.63 | $0.40 | $0.45 |
| Percent of customer's highly satisfied with NARA helpdesk services (average for year). | – | – | 65 | 83 | 87 |

*\*This data is not reliable because it reflects bot invasions that we are now able to exclude from later data.*

*FY 2010 Performance Plan Evaluation*    We will continue to improve our NARA IT infrastructure to ensure the performance meets our business need.  We will work to expand and integrate telework capabilities into agency operations.

# FY 2009 PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

## Strategic Goal 2: Preserve and Process

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 09-01, *Audit of the Controls over Presidential Library Textual Records,* January 14, 2009.

> The NARA Office of Inspector General (OIG) performed an audit of the internal controls to determine if sufficient management controls exist to safeguard and account for Presidential Library textual records. There were four recommendations made in the audit report. We have undertaken a comprehensive review of our policies on holdings protection to address these recommendations.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 09-04, *Audit Memorandum: Regional Archives Compliance with Procedures for Controlling Specially Protected Records,* January 15, 2009.

> The Inspector General issued this memorandum to inform the Assistant Archivist for Regional Records Services of regional archives non-compliance with procedures intended to provide additional protection to a subset of archival holdings known as Specially Protected Holdings (SPRA). There are four recommendations associated with this audit memorandum. We have undertaken a comprehensive review of our policies on holdings protection to address these recommendations.

Office of Administrative Services, *Physical Security, OSHA, and Accessibility Inspection,* May 2009.

> The office conducted an inspection of the Northeast Regional Records Center in Waltham, MA. There were two findings identified in this report, both of which remain open.

## Strategic Goal 3: Electronic Records

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 09-08, *Management Letter: Award Fee Program for the Electronic Records Archives Development Contract,* January 15, 2009.

> This management letter is to inform the Acting Archivist that the ERA development contract award fee program is not functioning in an efficient and effective manner. The management letter makes no specific recommendations, but details two conditions and nine issues.

Government Accountability Office, GAO-09-733, *The National Archives and Records Administration's FY 2009 Expenditure Plan*, July 2009.

> GAO's objectives in reviewing the expenditure plan were to determine the extent to which the expenditure plan satisfied the six legislative conditions specified in the Appropriations Act. GAO acknowledged NARA's continuing progress with ERA, and made five recommendations to better quantify our progress.

## *Strategic Goal 4: Access*

Office of Inspector General, Report 09-12, *Management Letter: Redaction Process at the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC),* April 29, 2009.

> With this management letter, the OIG brings to the Acting Archivist's attention that the NPRC has used a redaction practice that the auditor believes may compromise the privacy of the veteran. There are no specific recommendations associated with this management letter.

Office of Inspector General, Report 09-16, *Audit of NARA's Processing of Military Records (CMRS)*, September 30, 2009.

> The objective of this audit was to assess the management controls over the processing and distribution of veterans' record requests. Specifically, the OIG determined whether the process was sufficient to properly safeguard veterans' information in accordance with the Privacy Act and OMB policies. There are 14 recommendations associated with this audit.

Office of Inspector General, Report 09-17, *Management Letter: Failure to Provide Complete Information on Records Requests at the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC),* September 29, 2009.

> With this management letter, the OIG brings to the Acting Archivist's attention that for all armed services except the USMC, the NPRC routinely withholds records requested by veterans and their next of kin without notifying the requester. There are no specific recommendations in this letter.

## *Strategic Goal 6:  Infrastructure*

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 09-02, *Clifton-Gunderson LLP (CG) Audit of the National Archives and Records Administration FY 2008 Financial Statements,* December 4, 2008.

> The Inspector General contracted with Clifton Gunderson (CG) to conduct an audit of NARA's FY 2008 financial statements. CG made 13 recommendations to correct matters involving internal control and operations. Nine of these recommendations are closed and the remaining four will carry forward to the next report.

Office of Inspector General, Report 09-05, *Audit of NARA's Transition to Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6),* March 11, 2009.

> The objective of this audit was to assess NARA's efforts to transition to IPv6. Specifically, the auditor sought to determine whether NARA complied with the OMB mandate and, if not, to identify what major obstacles or challenges exist and whether a plan for compliance has been developed. There are five recommendations associated with this audit, two of which remain open.

Office of Inspector General, Report 09-09, *Audit of NARA's Change Control Process,* May 6, 2009.

> The objective of this audit was to determine whether NARA authorizes, documents, tests, and controls changes to its information systems. Specifically, the auditor reviewed whether the NARA change control process included (a) documenting, approving, testing, and reviewing of system changes; (b) security impact analysis; and ( c) adequate management and control of emergency changes. There are eight recommendations associated with this audit, all of which remain open.

Office of Inspector General, Report 09-10, *Audit of NARA's Workers' Compensation Program (WCP),* March 6, 2009.

> The overall objectives of this audit were to determine whether management controls were adequate for ensuring (1) the efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity of NARA's WCP and (2) whether NARA complied with established FECA regulations. There are six recommendations associated with this audit, five of which remain open.

Office of Inspector General, Report 09-13, *Audit of NARA's Vehicle Fleet Management,* August 26, 2009.

> The objective of this audit was to determine if fleet vehicles are adequately utilized and fleet resources are properly controlled. The OIG audit focused on NARA fleet management activities. The audit included onsite visits to College Park, MD (AII), Washington, DC (AI), Suitland, MD, and the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) in St Louis, MO. The two OIG vehicles were not included in the scope of this report. There are 12 recommendations associated with this audit, all of which remain open.

Office of Inspector General, Report 09-15, *Audit of NARA's Work at Home System (WAHS),* September 29, 2009.

> The objective of this audit was to determine whether the WAHS was developed in accordance with NARA requirements and efficiently and effectively met the requirements of the OMB memorandum M-06-16, Protection of Sensitive Agency Information. Specifically, they sought to determine whether the project proposal, plan, and approval were completed in accordance with NARA requirements and whether technical requirements were developed to meet OMB requirements for

remote access.  The audit was limited to the development, testing, pilot, and implementation of the WAHS.  There are seven recommendations associated with this audit.

## *Multi-Goal Evaluations*

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 09-14, *Evaluation of Management Control Program for FY 2008,* July 28, 2009.

>The Inspector General reviewed NARA's FY 2008 Management Control Program.  There are four recommendations associated with this report.  All four remain open.

Office of Regional Records Services, *Program Review*, January 2009.

>The office conducted a program evaluation of the Southwest Region in Fort Worth.  There were four recommendations made in this report, all of which remain open.

Office of Regional Records Services, *Program Review*, June 2009.

>The office conducted program evaluations of the Great Lakes Region in Chicago, Dayton, and Kingsridge.  There were three recommendations made in this report, all of which remain open.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Program Review*, February 2009.

>The office conducted a program review of the Richard Nixon Library in College Park, MD.  There were 12 recommendations made in this report, all of which remain open.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Program Review*, April 2009.

>The office conducted a program review of the Lyndon B. Johnson Library, in Austin, TX.  There were 33 recommendations made in this report, 21 of which remain open.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Program Review*, June 2009

>The office conducted a program review at the Herbert Hoover Library, in West Branch, IA.  The final report will be issued in November 2009.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Administrative Program Review*, July 2009

>The office conducted a program review at the Harry S. Truman Library, in Independence, MO.   There were 23 operational findings made in this report, all of which remain open.

# Federal Records Management Evaluations

Under 44 USC 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. This report focuses on Federal agency activities related to identifying, scheduling, and transferring electronic records to NARA, as well as reporting on allegations of unauthorized disposal or removal of Federal records. We also recognize the four agencies who received special awards for effective records management at NARA's annual Records Administration Conference in May 2009.

### Records Management Achievement

In FY 2009, NARA presented Archivist Achievement Awards to the following agencies for demonstrated success in implementing effective records management tools or practices:

- Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Interior (BoR)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- U.S. Marine Corps, the Department of Defense (USMC)
- National Reconnaissance Office (NRO).

BoR received its award for the successful design and implementations of its Reclamation Electronic Records Document System (REDS). EPA received two awards—the first for establishing an agency-wide document and records management task force to review existing practices, and a second award for developing and implementing an Enterprise Content Management System for capturing e-mail records. The U.S. Marine Corps received an award for its development of a records management web portal. The NRO received the final award in FY 2009 for its partnership with the agency Inspector General to improve the efficiency of its records management program.

### Electronic Records Management

In FY 2009, NARA continued its partnerships with Federal agencies to increase the number of electronic records series and systems scheduled across the Government and to increase the number of permanent electronic records transferred to the National Archives. Continuing the approach begun in 2004 following the passage of the E-Government Act of 2002, NARA concentrated on the important electronic records of the CFO Act agencies to ensure that all existing records are scheduled by the September 30, 2009, deadline established by NARA in accordance with the Act. These efforts will ensure that agency business assets are maintained for as long as needed, to protect the legal and financial rights of the Government and its citizens, and to preserve records of enduring historical value. We will report the results of Federal agency compliance with the E-Government Act in a separate report to Congress and OMB in FY 2010.

### Records Scheduling

In FY 2009, NARA set a goal to work with Federal agencies to schedule 498 electronic records series and electronic systems from the following CFO Act agencies and their components and bureaus:

Department of Homeland Security
Department of Health and Human Services
Department of Transportation
Department of Justice
Department of the Treasury
Environmental Protection Agency
Department of Commerce
Department of Interior
Department of Education
Department of Agriculture
Department of Labor
Central Intelligence Agency
Department of Defense
Department of State
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

With agencies devoting more attention and resources to scheduling to comply with the E-Government Act deadline of September 30, 2009, NARA exceeded its target goal of 498 by 55 percent, approving 770 electronic series and systems. By contrast, in FY 2008, NARA approved 451 electronic records series and electronic systems. Looking ahead to FY 2010, NARA will continue to work with agencies to identify and schedule all their electronic records series and systems. Although the September 30, 2009, deadline has passed, NARA will continue to provide oversight in this area until all agencies are compliant with the requirements of the E-Government Act.

NARA will publish a report to Congress and OMB in FY 2010 summarizing the work completed with agencies over the past five years to schedule all their electronic records series and systems. While that report will include more detail than is provided below, the following sections discuss selected agency achievements and other areas where NARA believes serious risks in agency records management programs need to be addressed.

### *Agency Recognition*

The following agencies made dramatic progress in ensuring that all their existing electronic records are scheduled.

*Department of State*. In FY 2009, the Department of State added new staff to concentrate on scheduling their electronic records. The increase in staff resources led to new records schedules submitted to NARA covering more than 30 electronic records systems. With the submission of these schedules, the Department of State has submitted all of the major systems to NARA for review and approval and is now compliant with the E-Government Act requirements.

*Department of the Treasury*. The Department of the Treasury emphasized electronic records scheduling at its Departmental Offices and nine bureaus. They held regular meetings and developed progress reports, and as a result, the Department is 100 percent compliant. With extensive training for staff, partnership with NARA, and focused records management staff, the Department was able to schedule a total of 926 identified series and systems of electronic records, including 26 websites for Treasury offices.

*Food and Drug Administration (FDA).* FDA, a component of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), has worked diligently over the past four years to schedule their electronic records and reach 100 percent compliance by the September 30, 2009, deadline. In FY 2009 alone, the FDA worked with NARA to gain approval of disposition authorities for 32 series of electronic records and systems.

*Southwestern Power Administration (SWPA).* Headquartered in Tulsa, Oklahoma, SWPA completed a three-year project working closely with NARA to complete an agency-wide records inventory and a comprehensive records retention schedule for all their records series and systems. The final records schedule includes 230 separate records series and systems.

### Challenges and Risks

Continuing the practice begun in FY 2008, NARA is reporting on agencies where we believe there are significant records management program risks. The following agencies have not devoted sufficient resources to scheduling their records and they have resisted outreach requests from NARA staff. NARA is concerned that these agencies are at high risk for litigation because they have not identified and scheduled their records for disposition.

*Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA).* The Defense Intelligence Agency has scheduled 3 series of electronic records out of 498 they have identified, or less than l percent of their total electronic records. Despite several years of NARA seeking to provide additional assistance to them, DIA has been unable to successfully focus on scheduling their electronic records. While DIA is in the process of producing a schedule to cover all of their electronic records, the agency's commitment and ability to properly schedule its records remains a concern.

*Defense Information System Agency (DISA).* Since FY 2004, DISA has not submitted any records schedules – electronic or otherwise—for NARA review. NARA has provided briefings for agency staff, including the Chief Information Officer; however, there has yet to be any significant progress in identifying and scheduling their records.

*Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA).* HRSA, within HHS, did not submit any records schedules to NARA to meet the September 2009 electronic records scheduling deadline. By their own accounting, only 3 percent of their electronic records are covered by a NARA-approved records schedule. In fact, HRSA has not submitted a records schedule to NARA for the past six years (i.e., since November 2003). In the past 15 years, HRSA has devoted very few resources to scheduling any of its records; in that time it only submitted seven records schedules to NARA covering 10 series of records.

*Joint Staff (JS), Combatant Commands (COCOMS).* Through Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction 5015.2, DoD Records Management Programs, the JS has administrative oversight of the COCOMS Records Management Programs. Joint Staff has submitted records schedules for Transportation Command's (TRANSCOM) electronic records, but not for the electronic records of the other COCOMS. Because the COCOMS—especially Central Command (CENTCOM)—play such a vital role in our war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, locating, scheduling, and preserving their records is a top priority for NARA.

*US Marshals Service*. The US Marshals Service, a component of the Department of Justice, has not submitted any records schedules for electronic records since 2000, and no records schedules for any format since 2003. The records of the Marshals Service are high value records that protect citizen rights and provide government accountability.

### Electronic Records Transferred to NARA

As of September 30, 2009, NARA registered 139 new accessions of electronic records from 39 agencies, including three from the US Supreme Court and three from the US Senate. Two transfers came from Temporary Commissions. In FY 2009, NARA also targeted a selection of CFO Act agencies and their components to bring into the National Archives the electronic records scheduled as permanently valuable and eligible for transfer.

The following agencies transferred new accessions of electronic records to the National Archives in FY 2009 for permanent preservation:

| Department | Agency | Number of Accessions in FY 2009 |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| Department of Agriculture | Agricultural Marketing  Service | 1 |
| Department of Commerce | Bureau of the Census | 30 |
| Department of Commerce | National Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin | 1 |
| Department of Defense | Inspector General | 1 |
| Department of Defense | Office of the Secretary of Defense | 9 |
| DOD, Department of the Army | Army Staff | 1 |
| DOD, Department of the Navy | Bureau of Naval Personnel | 4 |
| DOD, Department of the Navy | U.S. Naval Academy | 5 |
| Department of Education | Department of Education | 4 |
| Department of Energy | Department of Energy | 1 |
| Department of Health and Human Services | Agency for Health Care Research and Quality | 11 |
| Department of Health and Human Services | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 23 |
| Department of Homeland Security | U.S.  Customs and Border Protection | 1 |
| Department of Housing and Urban Development | Department of Housing and Urban Development | 1 |
| Department of Justice | Federal Bureau of Investigation | 2 |
| Department of Justice | Office of the Pardon Attorney | 1 |
| Department of Labor | Bureau of Labor Statistics | 2 |
| Department of the Interior | Bureau of Land Management | 6 |
| Department of the Interior | U.S. Geological Survey | 1 |
| Department of  State | Broadcasting Board of Governors | 1 |
| Department of State | Department of State | 1 |
| Department of State | U.S. Information Agency | 1 |
| Department of the Treasury | Bureau of Public Debt | 1 |
| Department of the Treasury | Office of Foreign Assets Control | 1 |
| Department of Transportation | Federal Aviation Administration | 4 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | Environmental Protection Agency | 2 |
| Federal Communications Commission | Federal Communications Commission | 2 |

| Department | Agency | Number of Accessions in FY 2009 |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |
| Federal Election Commission | Federal Election Commission | 1 |
| Federal Reserve System | Federal Reserve System | 3 |
| Merit Systems Protection Board | Merit Systems Protection Board | 1 |
| National Archives and Records Administration | National Archives and Records Administration | 1 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 1 |
| National Endowment for the Arts | National Endowment for the Arts | 2 |
| National Science Foundation | National Science Foundation | 1 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | Nuclear Regulatory Commission | 1 |
| Office of Personnel Management | Office of Personnel Management | 1 |
| Temporary Committees, Commissions and Boards | Temporary Committees, Commissions and Boards | 2 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | Tennessee Valley Authority | 1 |
| United States Senate | U.S. Senate | 3 |
| United States Supreme Court | U.S. Supreme Court | 3 |
|  | **TOTAL** | **139** |

The table below identifies the agencies that we targeted for transfer of permanent electronic records, the number of accessions they transferred, and the related number of targeted items.  The 117 transfers/accessions from agencies with FY 2009 targeted disposition authorities accounted for 84 percent of all electronic records transfers this year.

| Targeted Agency | Dept | Disposition Authorities (Items) Targeted FY 2009 | Accessions Received FY 2009 | Targeted Disposition Authorities for Accessions Received FY 2009 | FY 2008 Targeted Disposition Authorities NOT Received as of 9/30/2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Army | Army | 2 | **1** | 1 | 1 |
| Navy | Navy | 4 | **9** | 4 | 0 |
| Bureau of Land Management | DOI | 2 | **6** | 0 | 2 |
| Agency for Health Care Research and Quality | HHS | 2 | **11** | 1 | 0 |
| Center for Disease Control and Prevention | HHS | 1 | **23** | 1 | 0 |
| Commerce, Bureau of the Census | DOC | 12 | **30** | 9 | 3 |
| Defense, Natl Geospatial Intell Agency | DOD | 1 | **0** | 0 | 1 |
| Defense, Office of the Secretary | DOD | 7 | **9** | 4 | 3 |
| Education, Department of | DOEd | 8 | **4** | 4 | 4 |

| Targeted Agency | Dept | Disposition Authorities (Items) Targeted FY 2009 | Accessions Received FY 2009 | Targeted Disposition Authorities for Accessions Received FY 2009 | FY 2008 Targeted Disposition Authorities NOT Received as of 9/30/2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Energy, Department of | DOE | 6 | **1** | 1 | 5 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | EPA | 2 | **2** | 1 | 1 |
| Federal Aviation Administration | DOT | 4 | **4** | 4 | 0 |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation | DOJ | 1 | **2** | 1 | 0 |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency | DHS | 2 | **0** | 0 | 2 |
| Federal Supply Service | GSA | 1 | **0** | 0 | 1 |
| Fish and Wildlife Service | DOI | 2 | **0** | 0 | 2 |
| Forest Service | USDA | 2 | **0** | 0 | 2 |
| U.S. Customs and Border Control | DHS | 1 | **1** | 1 | 0 |
| U.S. Secret Service | DHS | 1 | **0** | 0 | 1 |
| Housing and Urban Development, Depart of | HUD | 2 | **1** | 1 | 0 |
| Justice, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms & Explosives | DOJ | 4 | **0** | 0 | 4 |
| Justice, Off of Justice Programs | DOJ | 1 | **0** | 0 | 1 |
| Interior, Department of | DOI | 4 | **0** | 0 | 4 |
| Internal Revenue Service | Treas | 1 | **0** | 0 | 1 |
| Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics | DOL | 2 | **2** | 0 | 2 |
| Labor, Dept of | DOL | 1 | **0** | 0 | 1 |
| Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration | DOL | 1 | **0** | 0 | 1 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | NASA | 2 | **1** | 1 | 1 |
| National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration | DOC | 3 | **1** | 0 | 1 |
| National Park Service | Interior | 1 | **0** | 0 | 1 |
| National Science Foundation | NSF | 1 | **1** | 1 | 0 |
| Nuclear Regulatory Commission | NRC | 1 | **1** | 1 | 0 |
| Office of Personnel Management | OPM | 2 | **1** | 2 | 0 |
| State, Department of | State | 4 | **1** | 1 | 3 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | TVA | 1 | **1** | 1 | 0 |
| Transportation, Dept of | DOT | 4 | **0** | 0 | 4 |
| Transportation, Federal Railroad Admin | DOT | 1 | **0** | 0 | 1 |
| Treasury, Bureau of the Public Debt | Treas | 1 | **1** | 1 | 0 |

| Targeted Agency | Dept | Disposition Authorities (Items) Targeted FY 2009 | Accessions Received FY 2009 | Targeted Disposition Authorities for Accessions Received FY 2009 | FY 2008 Targeted Disposition Authorities NOT Received as of 9/30/2009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Treasury, General Records | Treas | 1 | **1** | 1 | 0 |
| U.S. Geological Survey | USGS | 2 | **1** | 2 | 0 |
| U.S. Information Agency | State | 1 | **1** | 1 | 0 |
| **Total** | | **102** | **117** | **45** | **57** |

### *Alleged Unauthorized Disposition of Federal Records*

Under 44 USC 3106, Federal agencies are required to notify the Archivist of the United States of any alleged unauthorized disposition of the agency's records.  NARA also receives notifications from other sources such as the news media and private citizens.  NARA establishes a case to track each allegation and communicates with the agency until the issue is resolved.  Summary statistics on FY 2009 cases are as follows:

Open cases, start of FY 2009:   19 *
Cases opened in FY 2009:       10
Cases closed in FY 2009:        6
Open cases, end of FY 2009:    23

*  *Figure includes US Office of Government Ethics case inadvertently omitted from the FY 2008 PAR.*

Of the 23 cases open at the end of FY 2009, nine cases are involved in ongoing litigation and three cases are under investigation by the agency.  NARA monitors the status of these cases and is not reporting them here. The following two tables list the eleven cases that are open and pending a response from the agency and the six cases that were closed in FY 2009.

*Cases Awaiting Agency Response or Follow-Up*

| Case Opened | Agency | Records | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| August 1998 | **Dept. of Army**, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans | Records of action officers | Awaiting agency  response or follow-up |
| March 1999 | **Dept. of Interior**, Bureau of Indian Affairs | Records of Crow Agency, Montana | Awaiting agency  response or follow-up |
| May 2007 | **Executive Office of the President**, Office of Administration | Federal records in White House e-mail system | Awaiting agency  response or follow-up |
| July 2007 | **Federal Labor Relations Authority** | Records of FLRA Chair | Awaiting agency  response or follow-up |

| Case Opened | Agency | Records | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| April 2008 | **Dept. of Defense,** Office of Secretary of Defense | Video recordings of interrogations | Allegation founded- awaiting corrective action |
| May 2008 | **Dept. of Defense,** Defense Intelligence Agency | Video recordings of interrogations of terrorism suspect | Allegation founded- awaiting corrective action |
| December 2008 | **Dept. of Defense,** Office of Secretary of Defense | Documents relating to torture issue | Awaiting agency response or follow-up |
| February 2009 | **Dept. of Homeland Security** | Hard copies of Secretary's briefing books | Awaiting agency response or follow-up |
| July 2009 | **National Aeronautics and Space Administration** | Procurement records at Ames Research Center | Awaiting agency response or follow-up |
| August 2009 | **Dept. of Defense,** Defense Contract Management Agency | Records lost in fire in Ottawa, Canada | Awaiting agency response or follow-up |
| August 2009 | **Federal Trade Commission** | Consumer complaint letters | Awaiting agency response or follow-up |

*Note: in the case involving Federal records in the e-mail system of the George W. Bush Executive Office of the President, NARA has been kept regularly informed by the Office of Administration of the status of the ongoing restoration of e-mail records from backup tapes. In light of this representation, and in view of pending related litigation, NARA will ask for updates on further developments.*

The following table covers cases of alleged unauthorized disposition closed in FY 2009. Note that, when an allegation is founded, the affected agency takes corrective action to prevent additional unauthorized disposition of records.

*Cases closed in FY 2009*

| Case Opened | Agency | Records | Resolution |
|---|---|---|---|
| February 2008 | **U.S. Office of Government Ethics** | 1999 ethics agreements containing waivers or recusals | Allegation founded- corrective action taken |
| October 2008 | **Dept. of Interior,** Minerals Management Service | Records destroyed by employees of Southern Ute Indian Tribe | Allegation founded- corrective action taken |
| November 2008 | **Dept. of Defense,** Defense Commissary Agency | Visitor control files | Allegation founded- corrective action taken |
| February 2009 | **Dept. of Homeland Security,** Transportation Security Administration | Job application records of a prospective employee | Allegation not founded |
| May 2009 | **Dept. of Interior,** Bureau of Land Management | Records damaged by water in Rawlins, WY, field office | Allegation founded- corrective action taken |
| May 2009 | **Dept. of Justice,** Community Relations Service | Database of case files | Allegation founded- corrective action taken |

# Definitions

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

| Goal 1 | Our Nation's Record Keeper |
|---|---|
| Capital Asset Planning | An element in the decision-making process for ensuring that IT investments integrate strategic planning, budgeting, procurement, and the management of IT in support of agency missions and business needs. |
| COOP viability | NARA Headquarters and Federal Register must perform essential functions with and without warning regardless of emergency circumstances within 12 hours of activation of COOP for up to 30 days to include reconstitution of normal operations. Viability also includes regular testing, training, exercising of NARA personnel, equipment, systems, processes, and procedures used to support NARA during a COOP event. |
| Cooperative records project | A project that results in a model schedule, a standardized process, or other common product that standardizes records management for a specific FEA Business Reference Model sub-function across multiple agencies performing that sub-function.  For example, agencies engaged in providing investigative services would be considered as one cooperative records project. |
| Federal agency reference request | A request by a Federal agency to a records center requesting the retrieval of agency records.  Excludes personnel information requests at the National Personnel Records Center. |
| Inventory | A listing of the volume, scope, and complexity of an organization's records. |
| Proof of concept | Demonstration of new technology to show that an idea works. |
| Risk mitigation | 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. |

| Goal 2 | Preserve and Process |
|---|---|
| Accession | Archival materials transferred to the legal custody of NARA. |
| Appropriate space | Storage areas that meet 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. |
| Declassification review | An evaluation of the declassification 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 the appropriateness of agency declassification actions, the quality of agency actions to identify classified equities of other agencies, and the appropriateness of agency action to exempt records from automatic declassification based upon application of declassification guidance approved by the Interagency Declassification Appeals Panel or the application of file series exemptions approved by the President. 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 | An 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 3 — Electronic Records

| | |
|---|---|
| Gigabyte | A measure of computer data size. A gigabyte one thousand megabytes, $1,000^3$ bytes. Specifically not $1,024^3$ bytes. |
| 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 email message; each row in each table of a relational database or each row in an independent logical file database. |
| Megabyte (Mb) | A measure of computer data size. A megabyte is one million bytes, $1,000^2$ bytes. Specifically not $1,024^2$ bytes. |
| Preserved | (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. |
| Terabyte (Tb) | A measure of computer data size. A terabyte is one million megabytes, $1,000^4$ bytes. Specifically not $1,024^4$ bytes. |

## Goal 4 — Access

| | |
|---|---|
| Artifact holdings | Object whose archival value lies in the thing itself rather than in any information recorded upon it. |
| Electronic holdings | Records on electronic storage media. |
| 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 email message; each row in each table of a relational database or each row in an independent logical file database. |
| Online visit | 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 1 visit and 35 hits. Counting visits is a more accurate way of showing how much use our web site is getting than |

counting hits.

| | |
|---|---|
| Traditional holdings | Books, papers, maps, photographs, motion pictures, sound and video recordings, and other documentary material that are not stored on electronic media. |
| Written requests | Requests for services that arrive in the form of letters, faxes, email 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. |

| **Goal 6** | **Infrastructure** |
|---|---|
| Applicant | Any U.S. citizen who completed an application for a specific position. |
| Leadership position | A supervisory position at grade GS-13 or above and non-supervisory positions at grade 15 or above. |
| NARANET | A collection of local area networks installed in 37 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. |
| 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. |
| 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. |