S<small>ECTION</small> 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 2009 Strategic Plan and the annual objectives in our FY 2010 Performance Budget. The following pages detail our performance on our FY 2010 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 calculating earned value.

FY 2010 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 2016, 50 percent of agencies achieve passing scores for compliance with Federal records management policy.
	1.2 By 2016, 90 percent of customers are highly satisfied with NARA records management services.
	1.3 By 2016, records management transactions serviced by the Federal Records Centers Program grow by 6 percent.
	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.

FY 2010 Resources Available to Meet This Goal: $45,807,000; 1,694 FTE

1.1 FEDERAL RECORDS MANAGEMENT

FY 2010 Objectives	☑	50 percent of agencies' records management self-assessments received by NARA.
	☑	Conduct one records management study.
Results	✔	We received responses from 93 percent of agencies surveyed in the records management self-assessment.
	✔	We conducted an inspection of three electronic records areas at the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Discussion   In GAO's FY 2008 report entitled "Federal Records—National Archives and Selected Agencies Need to Strengthen E-Mail Management," 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 in which they document the condition of their records management

programs. We conducted our first self-assessment in FY 2009. Ninety-one percent of the more than 240 agencies polled, submitted their self-assessments. In FY 2010, 93 percent of agencies responded. Although the self-assessment is mandatory, we also attribute the high response rate to the availability of the survey online.

In FY 2010, substantial revisions were made to the self-assessment. To facilitate the scoring methodology, we reduced the number of open-ended questions to produce consistent responses among agencies and reduced the amount of subjectivity when deriving a score. In FY 2009, our focus was on five key areas: Program Management, Records Disposition, Vital Records, Electronic Records, and E-Mail Records. We refined our questions in FY 2010, combined electronic records and e-mail, and added a section to focus more closely on training. We expect to publish the report in early FY 2011.

As part of NARAs oversight activities, we perform inspections of Federal agency records management programs. The purpose of inspections is to ensure compliance with the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Criteria for selecting agencies for inspection are found in 36 CFR Part 1239 and states that we will conduct an inspection when an agency fails to address specific records management problems involving high risk to significant records. Other circumstances leading to an inspection include a request from an agency head that NARA conduct an inspection to address specific significant records management issues in the agency. Our FY 2010 inspection focused on several efforts at the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and at the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA). Additional information on these inspections can be found in the Federal Records Management Evaluations section of this report.

Due to the high percentage of agencies with high to moderate levels of risk with their records management programs, we plan to conduct at least two inspections in FY 2011. With a focus on training and continued advocacy of records management at the highest levels within an agency, we will work with agencies to decrease the risk to their records management programs.

Federal agencies are increasing their use of web 2.0 and social media tools to create and share information. We conducted a study to examine the affect this may have on the value of the recorded information in web 2.0 tools, such as internal and external blogs, wikis, social networking, and other collaborative web-based technologies. Our conclusions illustrated five major characteristics that may influence the value of records and information maintained in these formats; recommendations to improve management of these types of records; and confirmation that records created using social media tools should continue to be assessed based upon business, evidential, informational, and contextual values. Additional information about the FY 2010 records management study can be found at http://www.archives.gov/records-mgmt/resources/web2.0-use.pdf.

Performance Data	2009	2010
Performance target for percent of agencies achieving a passing score for compliance with Federal records management policy.	–	*Establish baseline*
Percent of agencies that achieve passing scores for compliance with Federal records management policy.	22	TBD
Performance target for percent of agencies records management self-assessments received by NARA.	–	50
Percent of agencies records management self-assessments received by NARA.	91	93
Number of agencies polled in self-assessment.	242	271
Number of agencies responding to self–assessment survey.	220	251

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   We will continue to address ways to decrease the risks to Federal records and improve agency records management practices through inspections, studies, and agency self-assessments. We will examine our statutory authority to manage electronic records under the Federal Records Act to determine whether NARA has sufficient authorities to meet our records management mission.

1.2 NARA RECORDS MANAGEMENT SERVICES

FY 2010 Objectives	☑	Digitize and post all approved agency records schedules from 1973 to present on NARA's public web site.
	☑	Increase by 5 percent the number of distance learning course offerings.
Results	✔	We scanned all unclassified NARA-approved records schedules from 1973 to the present and posted them on a newly developed Records Control Schedule web site.
	✔	We more than doubled the number of distance learning course offerings in self-paced and scheduled formats.

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. Equally critical are the principles outlined in the OPEN Government Directive, issued by the Obama Administration in December 2009. This Directive outlined the need for transformation in Government, where transparency, participation, and collaboration are the principles by which Government operates. Throughout FY 2010, we conducted activities directly in support of our mission with an eye toward advancing the principles of Open Government.

In FY 2010, we made available the Records Control Schedule (RCS) web site, found at http://www.archives.gov/records-mgmt/rcs/. This tool provides access to unclassified NARA-approved records schedules for Federal agency records dating back to 1973. As records schedules are approved, we will move them to the web site for six months for access to newly approved schedules. This service provides agencies with a repository of information to facilitate rapid records schedule development, enables cross records management program comparisons for effectiveness, and provides an active list of all approved schedules for ongoing inventory development.

In addition, we developed guidance for agencies on technology solutions, such as cloud computing, to inform agencies of records management implications when considering these types of products. Other guidance produced this year included *FAQs about Media Neutral Schedules*; *NARA's Report on Federal Web 2.0 Use and Record Value*; and *NARA's Electronic Records Project Report*, an assessment of agency progress in scheduling their electronic records.

We updated our Certificate of Federal Records Management Training program, updated training materials to reflect regulatory and procedural changes, and improved instructional design. We recognize that advances in technology, changes in laws and regulations, and other factors can influence how agencies manage their records. Because of this, ongoing records management training is an integral part of effective records management. We strive to identify and address challenges specifically impacting the Federal Government, by providing guidance and by training records managers throughout the Federal Government.

The NARA National Records Management Training Program provides a curriculum designed to enhance and improve the knowledge and skills of Federal records managers. However, because face-to-face classroom instruction often presents schedule or logistic difficulties, we increased the availability of distance learning, allowing us to circumvent these problems. Our offerings of distance learning training classes, including self-paced instruction and those offered through instructor-led Webinars, jumped from 12 in FY 2009 to 26 in FY 2010.

Although we experienced an unusually high increase in the number of Federal agency staff attending records management courses in FY 2009, our FY 2010 attendance follows the steady growth pattern as seen in prior years. More than 1,400 people have received professional records management certification since 2005.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
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.	78	81	—	81	—
Percent of records management training participants taking a NARA records management course for the first time.	35	43	39	63	36
Number of records management training participants who are taking a NARA records management course for the first time.	1,484	2,162	2,524	7,625	2,578
Number of Federal agency staff receiving NARA training in records management and electronic records management.	4,234	5,047	6,422	12,114	7,073
Number of records management training participants that NARA certified this year.	275	269	310	242	282
Performance target for the percent increase in the number of distance learning course offerings.	—	—	—	—	*5*
Percent increase in the number of distance learning course offerings.	—	—	—	—	133
Median time for records schedule items completed (in calendar days).	334	284	315	302	330
Average age of schedule items completed (in calendar days).	374	452	443	416	495
Number of schedule items completed.	3,884	2,983	3,282	3,221	2,269
Number of open schedules in the backlog.	358	428	575	1,053	1,042

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   We will begin work on a 5-year schedule to revamp existing courses to improve content, delivery and interactivity. We will begin

development of online training content as we continue development of Webinars.

1.3 FEDERAL RECORDS CENTER PROGRAM

FY 2010 Objectives	☑	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.
	☐	Increase customer satisfaction at NPRC by 3 percent.
	☑	Deploy ARCIS in remaining records centers.
	☐	Implement Increment 3 of ARCIS at Federal Records Centers.
	☑	Increase the number of records management transactions serviced by the Federal Records Centers Program (FRCP) by 1 percentage point.
Results	✔	We provided 98 percent of reference requests within the promised time.
"Keep up the excellent work."	✔	We answered 69 percent of written requests to the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) within 10 working days.
"I am proud of the service you provide to veterans."	✔	We achieved a 2 percent increase in customer satisfaction at the NPRC.
	✔	We deployed ARCIS to the National Personnel Records Center, the final Federal Records Centers in our deployment of the system.
	✔	We developed and tested additional functionality such as a customer portal and a billing module in ARCIS.
	✔	We exceeded our target and increased the number of records management transactions serviced by the Federal Records Center program by 2.45 percent.

Discussion NARA's reimbursable Federal Records Center Program (FRCP) plays a vital role in the lifecycle of Federal records. The program offers a host of services to assist Federal agency customers with the transfer, storage, and service of records to ensure the protection and availability of non-current records. The growth that we experienced in the past year resulted from efforts to market our products and services, outreach activities, and our responsiveness to customer needs.

We did not reach our target to respond to written requests to the National Personnel Records Center within 10 working days. Our delay in meeting the 10-day response time resulted from inefficient workflows and business processes, and steady increases in the number of requests for military personnel records. Our workflows involved the daily transport of large volumes of requests and records from our National Personnel Records Center Annex, an underground facility in Valmeyer, IL, to the technicians at the Military Personnel Records facility and the Civilian Personnel Records facility, both at different locations in St. Louis, MO.

To improve our business processes, we implemented our Case Management and Reporting System (CMRS) at the annex to process and manage requests for medical records transferred to NPRC from military treatment facilities. CMRS offers electronic delivery of requests between buildings, caseload queue management and assignment tracking. In addition, to minimize a growing backlog, we hired additional military correspondence technicians. We also relocated civilian correspondence technicians from the CPR to the annex, which will significantly reduce the amount to be transported. We are beginning to see an improvement in our average response times, and expect to see them continue next year.

Eighty-six percent of NPRC customers are satisfied with NPRC services, and although we improved, we fell modestly below our projected target. With the timeliness of responses directly relating to customer satisfaction, we expect our approach to improve responsiveness will also impact customer satisfaction.

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. In FY 2010, we deployed ARCIS to the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC), completing our deployment to all Federal Records Centers. We also made substantial progress on implementing the third increment of this software. In addition, we completed development and testing of the ARCIS customer portal in readiness for customer access in FY 2011.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
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	80
Number of customers (agreements) served annually.	–	142	250	250	204
Number of new customers (agreements) per year.	–	3	0	0	3
Performance target for of records management transactions growth in the Federal Records Center Program.	–	–	–	–	*1*
Percentage point growth in the number of records management transactions serviced by the Federal Records Center Program.	–	–	–	–	2.5
Performance target for percent of customers satisfied with NPRC services.	–	–	–	*Establish baseline*	*88*
Percent of customers satisfied with NPRC services.	–	–	–	*85*	*86*
Performance target for percent of Federal agency reference requests ready within the promised time.	*95*	*95*	*96*	*97*	*97*

Percent of Federal agency reference requests ready within the promised time.	98	97	97	97	97
Percent of customers with appointments for whom records are waiting at the appointed time.	99.8	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.8
Performance target for percent of written requests to the National Personnel Records Center answered within 10 working days.	–	*75*	*75*	*80*	*80*
Percent of written requests to the NPRC answered within 10 working days.	67	65	74	69	69
Number of written requests to the NPRC answered (in thousands).	1,110	1,139	1,216	1,314	1,421
Number of written requests to the NPRC answered within 10 working days (in thousands).	739	740	854	845	908
Number of written requests for civilian records to the NPRC answered within 10 working days (in thousands).	179	174	167	94	76
Number of written requests for military records to the NPRC answered within 10 working days (in thousands).	559	566	687	751	832
High Priority Measure: Performance target for percent of requests for military personnel records answered in 10 working days or less (target 85% by 2012).	–	–	–	–	*85*
Percent of requests for military personnel records answered in 10 working days or less.	61	59	72	70	73
Performance target for requests for military service separation records at the NPRC answered within 10 working days.	*95*	*95*	–	–	–
Percent of requests for military service separation records at the NPRC answered within 10 working days.	91	90	95	95	94
Number of military service separation records (DD-214) requests answered (in thousands).	401	426	483	546	523
Average price per request for military service separation records.	$29.70	$29.70	$30.10	$31.70	$31.70

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

FY 2011 Performance Plan We will provide work to improve our responsiveness to written requests to the National Personnel Records Center. We will expand ARCIS to include workflow engineering, support for local billing arrangements, and continued enhancements to the customer portal.

1.4 PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITIONS
FY 2010 Objectives   ☑   References LRPT 2.2

Discussion On January 20, 2009, NARA became the legal custodian of the records and artifacts documenting the Presidential Administration of George W. Bush. The work to process and store these records is tracked under Goal 2. The work of this objective focuses on the planning that occurs before and during a Presidential transition.

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 13526.

2.5 By 2016, 100 percent of archival holdings are stored in appropriate space.

2.6 By 2014, 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 2010 Resources Available to Meet This Goal: $209,769,000; 749 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 2009.

☐ 30 percent of archival records transfers arrive at NARA on time.

☐ 100 percent of agencies have registered schedules with NARA covering all existing electronic records and systems.

☐ Agencies submit 10 percent more records schedules using ERA than in FY 2009.

Results

✓ We scheduled 820 Federal agency electronic records series or systems reaching 94 percent of our goal.

✓ We received 27 percent of targeted traditional and electronic archival records on time.

✓ We published a semi-annual report titled *NARA's Electronic Records Project, Summary Report FY 2005 – FY 2009* on agencies' progress in scheduling their electronic records and systems.

✓ We received six agency records schedules submitted through ERA.

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 is vulnerable to increased risks.

To promote and facilitate the timely transfer of records to NARA, we established a deadline of September 2009 in compliance with section 207(e) of the E-Government Act of 2002 for agencies to submit records schedules to NARA for all their existing electronic records. By the deadline, we received responses from 67 percent of 240 agencies. Of those agencies that responded, we concluded that 25 percent had medium to high levels of risk in their records management programs. We delivered a summary report on *NARA's Electronic Records Project covering FY 2005 – FY 2009* that documented the strategies and results of NARA's concerted effort to assist agencies in scheduling and transferring permanent electronic records to NARA. The report highlighted the continued need to focus resources on exploring new strategies, techniques, and partnerships to further agency compliance with the requirements of the E-Government Act of 2002.

In addition, we met 94 percent of our goal to schedule more electronic records series and systems. This is the first year since the beginning of the project that we did not exceed the goal and we believe the explanation is twofold.   In an effort to meet the September 2009 deadline, agencies submitted the less complex schedules to NARA first, resulting in the more complex schedules needing to be process by NARA in FY 2010. In response, we did not increase staff resources sufficiently to fully meet our target.

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 expect that as more records schedules and processing are performed through our Electronic Records Archives (ERA), efficiencies will be realized. We began a pilot with four agencies for ERA's initial operating capability deployment in FY 2008 and have expanded the pilot to more than 20 agencies. However, the number of agencies submitting schedules through ERA continues to be modest. In FY 2011, as we finish ERA development activities, our priorities will be to focus our efforts on communication and specifically user adoption of this system.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Performance target for percent of high value archival records transferred to NARA at the scheduled time.	–	–	–	*20*	*30*
Percent of transfers of high value archival records transferred to NARA at the scheduled time.	–	–	–	21	27
Percent of high value traditional archival records transferred to NARA at the scheduled time.	–	–	–	6	24
Percent of high value archival electronic records transfers arriving at NARA on time.	–	–	40	44	35
Performance target for percent increase in records schedules submitted using ERA.	–	–	–	–	*10*
Percent increase in records schedules submitted using ERA.	–	–	–	–	–
Performance target for percent increase in number of Federal agency electronic records series or systems scheduled than prior year.	–	*10*	*10*	*10*	*10*
Percent increase in number of Federal agency electronic records series or systems scheduled than prior year.	10	33	31	60	3
Number of Federal agency electronic records series or systems scheduled.	612	423	496	794	802

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation We will continue working to improve the timeliness of records transfers to NARA while we continue to offer training and assess opportunities to use social media to reach a broader audience. As more agencies migrate to ERA, we will establish a baseline for records schedules submitted using ERA.

2.2 PROCESSING RECORDS

FY 2010 Objectives	☐	Increase by 10 points the percent of archival holdings processed to where researchers can have efficient access to them.
	☐	Train new archival staff in the processing of Presidential records.
Results	✓	Forty-seven percent of archival holdings are processed and available for researcher access.
	✓	We completed Individual Development Plans and assigned mentors to new archival staff in Presidential Libraries.

Discussion Eliminating the backlog of unprocessed archival records is an agency priority. With accessions increasing in number or volume each year, we have shifted and increased resources, refocused priorities, and redefined business processes to manage the workload. Processing this backlog of records will result in increased access for the public, greater intellectual control of the holdings, and enhanced preservation and physical protection of the records.

Archival processing is a multi-step process that 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.

We fell short of meeting this year's target to increase processed archival holdings available for access by researchers by 10 percentage points. While we have steadily improved processing efficiencies and are processing more holdings faster than prior years, the volume of accessions continues to rise, making it difficult to meet the target. Although we have streamlined our business processes to process holdings more efficiently, and adjusted resources to support this initiative, we will continue to be challenged in meeting our processing targets.

In FY 2010, we hired new archivists with the technical skills, organizational competencies, and knowledge needed to address our increasing workload. The staff was assigned to NARA's archival development program (ADP) where, based on Office of Personnel Management (OPM) policy, they are required to complete 160 hours of training over the two-year period of their program. We designed training that introduces the archivists to each program office and its work, explains administrative issues and procedures, and introduces them to partners and outside stakeholders.

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. With the addition of new archival positions for the existing Libraries with Presidential records—Reagan, Bush 41, and Clinton we are able to dedicate staff to both FOIA and systematic processing. We anticipate a significant increase in the Libraries' rate of processing.

Performance Data	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
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*	*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	10
Percent of archival holdings processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them.	–	21*	30	41	47

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

FY 2011 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 continue to train new staff in FOIA and systematic processing.

2.3 GOVERNMENT-WIDE DECLASSIFICATION

FY 2010 Objectives	☐	Sixty-nine percent of agency declassification reviews receive high scores as assessed by ISOO.
Results	✓	Our assessment of agency declassification review programs identified 67 percent of agencies receiving a high score.

Discussion The Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO), administered by NARA, oversees the Government-wide security classification program and reports annually to the President on its status. ISOO collects data about agencies' programs and conducts on-site reviews to assess those programs.

In FY 2008, ISOO developed a program to improve our oversight of Executive branch agencies' declassification review programs. The program was designed to evaluate agency decisions, identify best practices, and provide agencies with constructive recommendations to improve their programs. ISOO developed a scoring methodology and used a scoring tool to objectively evaluate agency declassification programs. Each year ISOO performs declassification review assessments for agencies with the goal to increase the percent of those achieving a high score.

At the end of FY 2009, ISOO offered assistance to agencies with the lowest scores. We provided this assistance to two agencies and they successfully climbed from the lowest category in FY 2009 to the highest in FY 2010.

Throughout the year ISOO provided additional training by meeting with agency declassification reviewers, instructing them on best practices, and providing guidance that limited or eliminated previously identified ISOO concerns. ISOO also provided specific training on changes concerning declassification policy based on the issuance of Executive Order 13526 "*Classified National Security Information*" to more than 130 agency representatives and began an effort to review all agency regulations per the new requirement.

Performance Data	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Performance target for percent of agency declassification reviews that receive high scores as assessed by ISOO.		–	*Establish baseline*	*51*	*69*
Percent of agency declassification reviews that receive high scores as assessed by ISOO.	–	–	36	53	67
Number of agency declassification reviews that receive high scores as assessed by ISOO.	–	–	8	10	10
Number of agency declassification reviews assessed by ISOO.	–	–	22	19	15
Number of pages declassified government-wide (in millions of pages).	37.6	37.2	31.4	28.8	TBD

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation ISOO will continue to implement the requirements of Executive Order 13526. We will also 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.

2.4 NARA DECLASSIFICATION

FY 2010 Objectives	☑	Increase by 10 percent the number of pages completed in the National Declassification Center (NDC) process.
	☑	Scan 500,000 pages of Presidential records eligible for declassification review as part of the Remote Archives Capture Project.
Results	✔	We increased the pages completed in the NDC process by 71.4 percent.
	✔	We scanned more than 530,000 classified records eligible for declassification.

Discussion   During the past few years, in cooperation with other agencies, NARA established an Interagency Referral Center and a quality assurance team under the banner of a National Declassification Initiative, to provide a systematic approach to the declassification process for classified Federal records. Since then, Executive Order 13526, issued by the President on December 29, 2009, the NDI became the National Declassification Center (NDC). The NDC is mandated by the President to provide the public with as many declassified records as quickly as possible while maintaining national security.   Agencies as well, are focusing their efforts and limited resources on the significant implementation requirements of the Executive Order and 32 CFR Par 2001, and in meeting the December 31, 2013, deadline concerning more than 400 million pages at NARA, requiring action.

NARA, charged with operating the NDC, retains physical and intellectual control of classified records. The NDC provides access for other government agency reviewers to adjudicate their equities within these records while allowing NARA to prioritize the order in which records are processed to handle records of high research interest in a timely manner.

To streamline processes in the NDC, NARA arranged with DOD's Lean Six Sigma Program Office to conduct a business process reengineering (BPR) study to enhance efficiency of the declassification process. The BPR concluded in the spring and new work processes were in place by mid-summer. Processes were redesigned to significantly decrease the amount of quality assurance review, facilitate a more efficient declassification workflow, and manage risks.

Following the principles of Open Government, we developed a draft Prioritization plan, and using social media tools as well as a public face-to-face open forum hosted by the Archivist, we invited input from agencies, the historical community, and the public on establishing declassification priorities. We established a web site and created a *NDC Blog* to encourage and facilitate public comment.   Our first semi-annual NDC status report highlighted the release of nearly 8 million pages of material to the public.

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 and to comply with E.O. 13526 by ensuring that we refer all 25-year-old classified documents to the appropriate equity agencies. The RAC project provides for the scan and capture in digital format of classified materials held by the Presidential Libraries throughout the country for review in a centralized location in Washington. The primary classifying agency uses a classified review system for review and declassification of their equities and transmits their decisions to a CIA center. The CIA center subsequently provides the Library with its declassification decisions. We successfully scanned 530,719 pages of Presidential records eligible for declassification, exceeding our goal of 500,000 pages.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Performance target for percentage point increase in the number of pages completed in the National Declassification Center process.	–	–	–	*10*	*10*
Percent increase in the number of pages completed in the NDC process.	–	–	–	–	71
Number of pages completed in the NDC declassification processing effort (in millions).	–	–	–	5.6	9.6*
Annual number of Federal pages declassified (in millions).	–	–	–	11.7	8.7*
Performance target for annual number of Presidential pages scanned (in thousands).	*500*	*500*	*500*	*500*	*500*
Annual number of Presidential pages scanned (in thousands).	506	512	519	545	531

* Data reported reflects activity beginning January 1, 2010 based on establishment of National Declassification Center.

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation NARA plans to manage and improve processes to eliminate our declassification backlog by the December 2013 deadline per the President's memorandum of December 29, 2009, and in accordance with Executive Order 13526.

2.5 ARCHIVAL HOLDINGS IN APPROPRIATE SPACE

FY 2010 Objectives	☐	Complete 50 percent of site work for first phase of Roosevelt Library renovation.
	☐	Complete design for second phase of Roosevelt Library renovation.
	☐	Update comprehensive space study for Johnson Library renovation.
	☑	Complete construction of Nixon Library expansion.
Results	✓	We awarded the construction contract for Phase I of the site work for the Roosevelt Library renovation.
	✓	We completed 75 percent of the design work for Phase II of the Roosevelt Library renovation.

✓   We prepared a draft space study report for the
     Johnson Library renovation.

✓   We completed all construction for the Nixon
     Library renovation.

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.

The renovation of the aging Franklin D. Roosevelt Library will provide environmentally
appropriate, safe, and secure space for the long-term care of archival and artifact
collections. The renovation also improves conditions for the staff, researchers, and
visitors and helps to increase productivity and satisfaction of the facility as a place for
work and research. In FY 2010, NARA awarded a construction contract for the first
phase of the Roosevelt Library renovation. The general site work to support new
mechanical and electrical equipment is on schedule for completion in 2011.

We also completed a substantial portion of the design work for the second phase of
construction at the Roosevelt Library. This work includes design for the first level of the
Library. Obstacles in completing the design for Phase II resulted from delays in
developing the exhibit design. The impact to the schedule is the completion of the design
will move to early FY 2011.

A space planning study was conducted at the Johnson Library. With the exception of
repairs to the plaza and replacement of several air handling units in the building, this
Library of nearly 40 years, has not undergone any significant renovations. Although our
report of the space study is in draft, our findings from the space survey indicate that the
Johnson Library is due for a major renovation and reconfiguration of space to improve
space utilization and efficiency of operations. We expect to complete the study in early
FY 2011.

The Nixon Presidential Library allows us to advance public access to materials of the
highest historical significance, streamline existing archival and museum activities by
combining operations in one location, and preserve these invaluable historical resources
in appropriate and secure space. The Library completed a renovation project of the
existing Nixon Library in Yorba Linda, California. The renovation was completed in FY
2007. We transferred Nixon Presidential holdings to that facility from two of our
facilities. With the transfer of artifact holdings and additional staff to operate the
Library, we encountered inadequate storage space and required an additional expansion
to hold all the materials stored in other archival space. We successfully completed the
expansion in FY 2010.

We are proud to receive the GreenGov Presidential Award for Leadership in
Environmental, Energy, and Economic Performance from the White House Council on

Environmental Quality.   NARA was cited in the "Lean, Clean and Green" category and designated as one of the most energy efficient and environmentally friendly places to work in the United States.   Recognized for our extraordinary achievement in implementing sustainable infrastructure and operational changes at our National Archives Building in College Park, saving taxpayer money, and eliminating carbon emissions, we remain steadfast in our commitment to maintain and improve our facilities around the country.   Our implementation of energy-saving measures such as solar panels, digital air handlers, and light switches replaced by motion sensors, resulted in a 28 percent reduction in energy needs and a 14 percent reduction in water consumption—shaving off $400,000 from our energy bill.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Percent of NARA archival traditional holdings in appropriate space.	57	80	81	82	82
Number of archival traditional holdings (in thousands of cubic feet).	3,296	3,346	3,729	3,937	4,032
Percent of artifact holdings in appropriate space.	42	42	40	37	37
Number of artifact holdings (in thousands).	544	544	582	628	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).	4,611	4,737	5,523	6,704	6,944
High Priority Measure: Percent of archival holdings in NARA 1571 compliant space (target 85% by 2012).	57	80	81	82	–
Percent of archival holdings in NARA 1571 compliant space.	–	–	–	–	82
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*	*$5.84*
Cost of archival storage space per cubic feet of traditional holdings stored.	$6.65	$6.20	$5.85	$5.83	$6.13

FY 2011 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 at the Roosevelt and Johnson Presidential Libraries, to improve services to researchers and the public. We will improve visitor flow and access as part of the National Archives Experience as well as open the National Personnel Records Center facility in St. Louis County.

2.6 NARA FEDERAL RECORDS CENTER HOLDINGS IN APPROPRIATE SPACE

FY 2010 Objectives	☐	Move remaining holdings into National Personnel Records Center Annex.
Results	✔	We successfully moved a majority of the temporary holdings slated for storage in the NPRC Annex in Valmeyer, IL, from our Military Personnel Records and Civilian Personnel Records facilities.

Discussion: In accordance with 36 CFR Part 1234, the Archivist is responsible for specifying the facility standard and approval processes that apply to all records storage facilities Federal agencies use to store, service and dispose of their Federal records. In this role, we often advise Federal agencies or inspect their facilities to bring their facility under regulatory storage compliance. We hold our facilities to the same standards.

In FY 2008, we completed a lease agreement for a National Personnel Records Center Annex to house temporary records from our Military Personnel Records Center (MPR) and Civilian Personnel Records Center (CPR) in space that is compliant with the Federal regulatory standards for records storage. We moved into the new Annex, which is located in underground space in Valmeyer, IL, in FY 2009. During FY 2009, due to continued high demand for Federal Records Center storage space, we transshipped low activity records from other regional facilities to the Annex, adjusting our move plans for remaining MPR and CPR records accordingly. In FY 2010, we leased an additional 2.5 bays of storage space in the Annex to accommodate the remaining MPR and CPR records originally scheduled to move there. That move will be completed in FY 2011.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
High Priority Measure: Performance target for percent of NARA records center holdings stored in appropriate space (target 85% by 2012).				*100*	—
Percent of NARA records center holdings stored in appropriate space.	—	—	—	—	60
Percent of NARA records center facilities certified as meeting the 2009 regulatory storage standards.	9	29	33	48	48
Volume of records center holdings (cubic feet in millions).	25.1	25.7	26.6	27.2	27.6
Storage price per cubic foot for records center holdings.	$2.28	$2.28	$2.40	$2.40	$2.52

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation Our Federal Records Center Program continues to implement infrastructure upgrades and compliant storage solutions as required for Federal temporary records.

2.7 PRESERVATION

FY 2010 Objectives ☐ Appropriately treat and remove 85,000 cubic feet of NARA's at-risk archival holdings from preservation backlog.

☑ Deploy Holdings Management System (HMS) in the National Archives in Washington, DC, and in two regional facilities.

Results ✓ We treated and removed 56,155 cubic feet of at-risk archival holdings from the preservation backlog.

✓ We deployed HMS in the National Archives in Washington, DC, and in the Boston and Philadelphia regional archive facilities.

Discussion: NARA's mission is rooted in preserving and providing access to the permanent records of the Federal Government—now, and in the future. Approximately two-thirds of NARA's textual and non-textual records are at risk of not being preserved and available for future generations. We are tackling a wide 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.

This year we treated 109,940 cubic feet of at-risk holdings and removed more than 56,000 cubic feet from our at-risk preservation backlog. Decreasing the backlog is often met by challenges due to unusually large increases in new at-risk records, increased demand for digitization, and large increases or shifts in the public demand for use of at-risk records. Although these challenges weakened our ability to meet our target, we were able to surpass the number of at-risk removed from the backlog in FY 2009. We anticipate that these factors as well as possible preservation work on some of our classified special media holdings will impact our progress against this backlog in FY 2011.

In our Presidential Libraries, many of the at-risk holdings are audiovisual materials that offer priceless insight into the lives of Presidents and their families. These materials typically require more resource intensive preservation treatments, however, most of the preservation projects for these nontextual materials result in small volumes of holdings treated.

To ensure efficiency in controlling holdings and targeting Federal records with the greatest preservation needs, NARA has developed a Holdings Management System (HMS). 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. We are using the HMS to document risk, enhance security by tracking location and use, track preservation actions completed, and other critical information about all of NARA's non-electronic archival holdings.

HMS was implemented for textual units at the National Archives in College Park in FY 2009. This year, we deployed HMS to the National Archives Building in Washington, DC and to our regional archive locations in Boston and Philadelphia. The initial implementation includes space management, circulation of records to staff, preservation risk assessment, and work requests for preservation and other activities. We are challenged with migrating legacy data, however, as deployments of HMS are staged across our facilities, we build on lessons learned to reduce risks and facilitate each subsequent deployment. 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	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Performance target for percent of archival holdings that require preservation action.	–	*Establish Baseline*	*≤65*	*≤65*	*≤65*
Percent of archival holdings that require preservation action.	–	65	65	65	64
Backlog of holdings requiring preservation action (in thousands of cubic feet).	2,182	2,163	2,425	2,571	2,595
At-risk archival holdings that received preservation treatment this year (thousands of cubic feet).	28	56	125	116	110
Cumulative volume of at-risk archival holdings in cold storage (thousands of cubic feet).	90	90	91	93	94
Performance target for NARA's at-risk archival holdings	–	–	–	–	*85*

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
treated and removed from preservation backlog this year (thousands of cubic feet).					
NARA's at-risk archival holdings treated and removed from preservation backlog this year (thousands of cubic feet).	–	–	91	46	56

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   We will continue to treat our at-risk records to prevent loss of historically, valuable information in addition to conducting preservation reviews at six NARA locations. We will deploy HMS at three additional 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 2010 Resources Available to Meet This Goal: $98,178,000; 96 FTE

3.1 PROCESSING ELECTRONIC RECORDS

FY 2010 Objectives	☑	Sustain 80 percent of archival electronic holdings processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them.
	☑	Complete 80 percent of data migration of holdings from legacy systems migrating to the initial ERA system for Federal records.
Results	✔	We sustained 88 percent of our archival electronic holdings processed to the point where researchers have efficient access to them.
	✔	We completed the data migration of 80 percent of holdings from legacy systems migrating to the ERA Base system for Federal records.

Discussion We must guarantee the continuing accessibility of permanent electronic records of all three branches of our Government despite the fact that the volume, variety and complexity of records coming to the National Archives is increasing.

Although the number of fully processed accessions of electronic holdings increased by 8 percent in FY 2010, we maintained last year's performance of sustaining 88 percent of archival electronic holdings processed and available for researcher access.

We have implemented the Electronic Records Archives (ERA) to address the challenge of this growing volume of electronic records. We identified an initial set of legacy electronic holdings accessions and have migrated 80 percent of those electronic holdings along with related metadata in the system. The legacy migration workflow proved challenging with unanticipated problems occurring in migrating the related legacy metadata. We will use the lessons learned through these trials when preparing for the next set of legacy migrations.

As of FY 2010, our ERA storage volume was approximately 83 terabytes. In FY 2011, we anticipate transfers and accessions of electronic holdings from the Census Bureau with records from the 2010 Census to include approximately 500 terabytes of data.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Performance target of percent of NARA's electronic holdings stabilized.	–	*80*	*80*	*85*	*85*
Percent of NARA's electronic holdings stabilized.	89	89	90	88	86
Performance target for percent of archival electronic accessions processed to the point where researchers can have efficient access to them.	*80*	*95*	*80*	*80*	*80*
Percent of archival electronic accessions processed.	80	81	86	88	88
Number of accessions received.	2,010	2,153	2,328	2,476	2,674
Number of accessions processed.	1,615	1,738	2,004	2,188	2,349
Unprocessed accessioning backlog (in accessions).	395	415	324	288	325
Median time (in calendar days) from the transfer of archival electronic records to NARA until they are available for access.	259	467	2,127*	1,842*	2,209*

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

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   We will continue the migration of data from the legacy media to ERA Base. 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 PRESERVING ELECTRONIC RECORDS

FY 2010 Objectives   ☐   Define criteria and policy for establishing planned levels of service to preserve and make available archival electronic records.

Results   ✔   We developed a draft of our Transformation Framework and Model and a draft of our Transformation and Significant Properties principles.

Discussion   NARA currently provides one level of service for its electronic records: we preserve the records in the format in which we receive them, ensuring that the data remains unchanged and uncorrupted over time. Our focus this year was in developing the policy and system capabilities that are preconditions to additional levels of service, including transformation of electronic records to mitigate the risk of the original format becoming obsolete and the design of our public access interface. Since we cannot yet provide levels of service above the basic one and are still developing the system that will provide them, we have not yet fully defined the criteria for future levels of service or the criteria for selecting a level of service for a specific set of records. However, we have done much of the work that will allow us to define additional levels as additional capabilities come online.

We developed a Transformation Framework that will guide the transformation of electronic records in ERA. The Transformation Framework includes preservation principles that deal with concepts such as the authenticity of records and the treatment of original records. Together with the framework, we developed our Transformation and Significant Properties principles. These are the principles NARA will use in

transforming records from one format to another. The document addresses the significant properties that must be preserved as documents are transitioned from one format to another – to ensure continued accessibility, usability, and meaning of records. The steps NARA needs to take during the lifecycle management of these records are also included.

To further evaluate these transformation principles, we completed a prototype of ERA transformation functionality that will enable us to easily evaluate transformation tools and approaches. We benchmarked our approach with other institutions. Using the prototype, we were able to ingest, characterize, and transform records for access or preservation purposes and validate that the transformations we created were authentic. Transformations of MS Word documents to Adobe PDF; MS Excel to both PDF and Open Document Spreadsheet (ODS) formats; and EBCDIC to ASCII demonstrated the successful capabilities of the prototype.

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   We will move the ERA transformation prototype into production and integrate the first of the transformation utilities, EBCDIC to ASCII.

3.3 COST OF ELECTRONIC RECORDS MANAGEMENT

FY 2010 Objectives	☑	Deploy preservation framework design, as well as prototypes for specific formats.
	☐	Deploy online public access functions for ERA system.
	☑	Expand ERA pilot to at least 20 and up to 29 additional Federal agencies.
	☑	Deploy a Congressional instance of ERA.
Results	✓	We conducted a demonstration of the preservation framework prototype.
	✓	We deployed an online public access prototype to NARA staff.
	✓	We conducted Designated Agency Representative (DAR) training to representatives from 21 different agencies.
	✓	We accomplished a major milestone with the deployment of Congressional Records Instance of ERA.

Discussion   We successfully developed and demonstrated a transformation framework prototype based on the principles in our Transformation Framework outlining criteria for long-term preservation and access to permanent electronic records in ERA. The prototype allowed us to move beyond the conceptual discussion of electronic record transformation to the implementation of demonstrated capability. This prototype was designed to model the capability to plan, execute, and monitor a preservation process on a set of records, store a preservation copy, identify relationships to previous versions of a

record, and provide access to the preservation copy of the records. This is the first step in ensuring the accessibility of electronic records in ERA, regardless of whether the software used to create the record is still available. We conducted eight demonstrations of the transformation prototype and received positive feedback from our stakeholder audience.

NARA's flagship initiative in our Open Government plan is to develop online services to meet the 21st century needs of the public.   NARA's Online Public Access (OPA), is our first step in providing a resource with an improved federated search capability and an enhanced display. The Online Public Access resource will be the online public portal to ERA.   The OPA prototype explores new ways to provide public access to NARA's records, and it demonstrates a new concept for the search and display of electronic records, and employs innovative user interface functions that will be needed once fully deployed.   We offered NARA staff access to the prototype of (OPA) and received useful feedback that we will incorporate in the general public release at the end of 2010.   This release will allow those accessing from the public to conduct simple and advanced searches across many types of data and records. For the first time, NARA will be providing online access to the 1940 Census images through OPA in FY 2012.

We set a goal to expand ERA to at least 20 agencies in FY 2010. We conducted a pilot centered around goals to evaluate ERA functionality, understand the effectiveness of the web based training on ERA, and analyze the efficacy of the Designated Agency Representative (DAR) process.   More than 20 agencies participated in the DAR training that offered instruction for agency representatives who will manage ERA accounts for their agencies. To increase agency participation and prepare for mandatory Federal agency use, we will focus our attention in FY 2011 on accelerated user adoption of ERA.

The White House announced recently that ERA was one of OMB's high priority IT investments. We are targeting a mid-2011 timeframe for demonstrating our success in making the system ready for use by all agencies. By mid-2012, we fully anticipate that ERA will be required for all Federal agencies to transfer their permanent electronic records to NARA.

We achieved a significant milestone in the deployment of the Congressional Records Instance of (CRI) ERA. This specialized instance of ERA supports the management and access to Congressional assets.   The Congressional Records Instance provides ingest capability and maintenance of defined collections of assets from Congress. The instance currently houses approximately 150,000 megabytes of records.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Performance target for megabyte cost to manage archival electronic records.	–	–	–	*Establish baseline*	*<$0.36*
Per megabyte cost to manage archival electronic records.	$0.43	$0.37	$0.39	$0.36	$0.15
*Number of terabytes of archival electronic records managed by NARA (includes pre-accessioned electronic records).	16.8	17.8	18.2	19.2	100.4**

Number of terabytes of archival electronic records managed in ERA (includes pre-accessioned electronic records).	–	–	–	77	83

* These figures represent terabytes in the sense more specifically called tebibytes (TiB), the International Electrotechnical Commission standard unit based on a multiplier of 1024 bytes as a measure for a Kilobyte, as opposed to the International System of Units (SI) standard unit, which uses a multiplier of 1000 bytes as a measure for Kilobyte. ** Figures prior to FY 2009 do not include ERA.

FY 2011 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 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 2010 Resources Available to Meet This Goal: $56,336,000; 320 FTE

4.1 NARA CUSTOMER SERVICE STANDARDS

FY 2010 Objectives

☑ 93 percent of written requests are answered within 10 working days;

☑ 94 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.

☑ Operate a government-wide Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) program to strengthen FOIA and ensure an open and accessible government.

Results

"Thank you for your help in locating and send me copies of the correspondence between my late grandmother and Mrs. Roosevelt. I was thrilled to receive the packet of letters!"

✓ We answered 93 percent of written requests within 10 working days.

✓ We provided 96 percent of items requested in our research rooms within 1 hour of the request or scheduled pull time.

✔ We answered 89 percent of Freedom of Information Act requests within 20 working days.

✔ We completed 96 percent of our online archival fixed-fee reproduction orders in 20 working days or less.

"…good service by government employees is often not recognized or acknowledged. I appreciate your very prompt and courteous service."

✔ We operate a fully staffed Office of Government Information Services.

Discussion We successfully met or exceeded all of our customer service targets in FY 2010. In our research rooms, our customers received requested research materials within one hour 96 percent of the time. We responded to customers' written requests within 10 working days 93 percent of the time. Ninety-six percent of the time we responded to online archival reproduction orders within 20 working days—a 6-percentage-point increase in the rate completed in the prior year. This consistently positive trend reflects our commitment to provide more timely responses to these important requests.

The OPEN Government Act of 2007 amended the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. Section 552) to create an Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) within NARA. The new office opened in early September 2009.

OGIS reviews policies and procedures of administrative agencies under FOIA, reviews agency compliance with FOIA, and recommends policy changes to the Congress and the President to improve the administration of FOIA. OGIS's mission also includes providing services to mediate disputes between FOIA requesters and Federal agencies, developing an innovative approach to reduce litigation, and improving the FOIA process for the public and the Government.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Performance target for written requests answered within 10 working days.	*95*	*90*	*91*	*92*	*93*
Percent of written requests answered within 10 working days.	97	95	94	95	93
Performance target for Freedom of Information Act requests for Federal records completed within 20 working days.	*90*	*85*	*86*	*87*	*87*
Percent of Freedom of Information Act requests for Federal records completed within 20 working days.	87	88	89	86	89
Number of FOIAs processed (Federal and Presidential).	8,889	12,406	13,483	17,512	15,769
Annual cost to process FOIAs (in millions).	$2.62	$2.72	$2.34	$2.76	$2.97
Annual per FOIA cost.	$295	$219	$173	$158	$189
Performance target for items requested in our research rooms furnished within 1 hour of request or scheduled pull time.	*95*	*95*	*90*	*93*	*94*
Percent of items requested in our research rooms furnished within 1 hour of request or scheduled pull time.	96	86	93	93	96
Number of researcher visits to our research rooms (in thousands).	132	136	140	129	137
Number of items furnished in our research rooms (in thousands).	421	520	576	553	563
Number of items furnished on time in our research rooms (in thousands).	405	449	537	515	538

Performance target for archival fixed-fee reproduction orders through SOFA are completed in 20 (35 pre-2007) working days or less.	*85*	*85*	*85*	*90*	*90*
Percent of archival fixed-fee reproduction orders through SOFA are completed in 20 (35 pre-2007) working days or less.	97	72	68	90	96
Average per order cost to operate fixed-fee ordering.	$28.74	$26.67	$30.59	$38.06	$40.49
Average order completion time (days).	14	17	22	18	13

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   We expect to meet or exceed our published standards for customer service. Our newly established Office of Government Information Services will continue to implement methods to improve FOIA practices government-wide and ensure an open and accessible Government.

4.2 ONLINE ACCESS TO ARCHIVAL HOLDINGS

FY 2010 Objectives   ☑   Meet 30 percent of the 2012 target for archival holdings accessible online.

                             ☐   Complete digitization of 1940 Census.

Results   ✓   We exceeded our target for both traditional and electronic archival holdings accessible online.
  "A superb example of what the web can do to bring history directly to the historian, student, journalist, etc., no matter where they are located."
                             ✓   Staffing, training, and work process issues have delayed the completion date of the scanning effort.

Discussion   The Obama Administration issued the *Open Government Directive* which promotes new lines of communication and cooperation between the Federal Government and the American people. In response to the directive, and with input from both NARA staff and the public, we crafted *NARA's Open Government Plan.* Our flagship initiative, *Develop Online Services to meet our 21st Century Needs*, addresses the following four areas of focus: a social media strategy, improved search capabilities, a website designed for staff and public participation, and a strategic approach to digitization.   Key projects developed from the initiative include "AOTUS: Collector in Chief," the blog of the Archivist of the United States; the "Our Archives" wiki, which encourages "citizen archivists" to contribute their expertise and guidance to NARA; the publishing of high value datasets on Data.gov; and the creation of NARA's Open Government web page.

We actively engage in four major strategies to increase the amount of archival material that we provide online. These strategies include partnerships to digitize selected traditional archival material, collecting existing digital copies of traditional archival material, and exploring innovative NARA-led projects for digitizing archival material. We also focus on making "born digital" electronic records available as soon as possible. In FY 2010, we added nearly 30,000 digital files created by NARA to the Archival Research Catalog (ARC). These files included nearly 900 digital images of President Ford's daily diary; more than 2,900 Escape and Evasion Reports for World War II; hundreds of films held by our Motion Pictures sections; and in excess of 23,000 photographs documenting the Secretary of Interior's activities. Our digitization partners have digitized more than 60 million NARA images.   The variety and volume of

information reaches across our many customer audiences and delivers to them a wealth of historical information.

Even with the significant progress made this year to make more of our holdings accessible online, we have a tremendous task ahead of us. Impediments to increasing the percentages are the sheer volume of records received each year. In addition, we are limited in the scalability of ARC, which then limits our ability to add metadata and digital objects. There are currently 4.4 million descriptions in ARC. We anticipate that full capacity ranges between 8 and 10 million descriptions, and our partners have already surpassed this limitation. To address this issue, we awarded a contract this year for a new description tool that would provide for the addition to NARA's catalog of all metadata and images created by our partners.

We have established partnerships with both private partners and public institutions, to advance the goal of making more holdings accessible online. This year alone we received 80,000 images of *Death Reports of American Citizens Who Died Abroad*, the first set of materials created under the Ancestry partnership; 11,466 reels of microfilm from Footnote; and to date, we have received almost 29 million images from Footnote.com. A collaborative project exists between NARA and the United Kingdom National Archives and the German Bundesarchiv to provide online access to digital images of records related to Holocaust-era looted cultural property.

We continue to expand the breadth of tools available to access our data. Through social media, our exposure to new audiences is growing. We joined *Flickr Commons,* a web site for cultural institutions to share their photograph collections. The NARA Flickr photostream has received more than one million views and 8,000 user-generated tags. The Presidential Libraries are also participating with a collection of images from the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library and Museum and images of the Flathead Irrigation Project held by the National Archives at Denver will be added through a pilot program. Our presence through *Facebook, blogs, Twitter, wikis* and other social media venues enhances our interaction with customers.

NARA holds the records of the 1940 Census, scheduled for public release in April 2012. The Census release is widely anticipated by the genealogical and family history communities with the expectation that users will be able to search the information on the Internet. The 1940 Census schedules were transferred to NARA custody in microfilm format and could have been made available for use in that format. In keeping with government-wide goals, however, NARA decided to create opportunities for expanded online access to Census information by digitizing the microfilmed 1940 schedules. The decision enabled NARA to update equipment, train staff, and revise work processes in support of a transition to a digital reformatting environment. We set an ambitious deadline for completion of the digitization work, but our ramp up to production took longer than predicted and we have had to make significant changes in work processes as we have gained experience. We are confident that the lessons we have learned during this year, combined with a re-allocation of staffing resources, will enable us to complete the digitization and associated metadata capture by April 2011, well in advance of the anticipated release data.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Performance target for percent of archival holdings accessible online.	–	–	–	–	*.30*
Percent of traditional archival holdings available online.	–	–	.04	.04	.6

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Percent of electronic archival holdings available online.	2.1	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.4
Performance target for percent increase in ARC visits.	–	–	*10*	*10*	–
Percent increase in ARC visits.	-11	15	131	-6	-4
Number of ARC visits (in thousands of visits).	254	291	671	631	603

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   We will continue to 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 2010 Objectives	☑	Describe 70 percent of NARA traditional holdings in the Archival Research Catalog (ARC).
	☑	Describe 70 percent of NARA artifact holdings in ARC.
	☑	Describe 70 percent of NARA electronic holdings in ARC.
Results	✔	We described 70 percent of NARA traditional holdings in ARC.
	✔	We described 78 percent of NARA artifact holdings in ARC.
	✔	We described 96 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 approximately 4.4 million descriptions and links to more than 157,020 digital images of some of our most sought after holdings.   ARC is 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 Online Public Access (OPA) catalog by the end the year when OPA will be offered to the public. Eventually, OPA will fully replace the public side of ARC.

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. We attribute a growing number of series descriptions in ARC to processing initiatives in our program offices. Growing efficiency in describing the holdings leads to the positive results demonstrated in our success to meet or exceed our target for each category of holdings that we describe. However, as we complete descriptions for larger series, our percent completion is smaller.   In addition, we captured data from existing finding aids and included this information in ARC.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Performance target for traditional holdings in an online catalog.	*50*	*55*	*60*	*65*	*70*

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Percent of traditional holdings in an online catalog.	51	56	64	70	70
Number of traditional holdings described in an online catalog (millions of cubic feet).	1.7	1.9	2.4	2.7	2.8
Number of traditional holdings in NARA (millions of cubic feet). *	3.3	3.3	3.7	4.0	4.0
Performance target for artifact holdings in an online catalog.	*50*	*55*	*60*	*65*	*70*
Percent of artifact holdings in an online catalog.	57	57	61	74	78
Number of artifact holdings described in an online catalog (thousands of items).	309	309	353	465	466
Number of artifact holdings in NARA (thousands of items).	544	544	582	628	628
Performance target for electronic holdings in an online catalog.	*20*	*55*	*60*	*65*	*70*
Percent of electronic holdings in an online catalog.	98	99	98	95	96
Number of electronic holdings described in an online catalog (billions of logical data records).	4.5	4.7	5.4	6.4	6.7
Number of electronic holdings in NARA (billions of logical data records).	4.6	4.7	5.2	6.7	6.9
Number of series described in ARC (cumulative).	31,561	49,691	74,544	102,250	TBD
Number of ARC users (in thousands of visits).	254	291	671	631	603

* 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 2011 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 release the OPA prototype to the public.

4.4 WEB SITES

FY 2010 Objectives   ☑   Improve NARA's score against the benchmark for excellence by 3 percentage points.

☑   Redesign *archives.gov* web site.

Results   ✔   We exceeded the benchmark for excellence by 5 percentage points.

"Powerful lessons in information and transparency. Thanks for the teachable moment."   ✔   We redesigned the *archives.gov* web site scheduled for launch in FY 2011.

Discussion   We use the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) to determine how satisfied our online customers are with our web sites. The ASCI helps us to measure satisfaction by customer groups (e.g. genealogists, veterans, educators, students, etc.) and use this valuable feedback to understand their experience on our web sites. 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.   Our implementation of improved search engine capability in response to past feedback resulted in higher

satisfaction levels. We recognize the value of feedback and look for ways to ensure we meet customers' needs.

Early in the fiscal year, ACSI offered new questions on agency transparency and visitor social media preferences (e.g. Twitter, Facebook, etc.). This year we received the highest score—74 percent—since the survey was launched in 2003. We attribute this improved overall satisfaction score to our increased transparency.

We incorporated the principles of Open Government in our effort to redesign *archives.gov*. Transparency, participation, and collaboration were the principles that guided us as we enhanced the web site. We requested active involvement from NARA staff, NARA content contributors, and our online customer community. Although challenged with requirements to streamline navigation, improve access to holdings, simplify content, and update the visual design, we have involved our community of users more than ever. We presented four home page designs, and using IdeaScale, an online social voting tool, we opened up voting to the public for 10 days. Votes were also accepted in person at the National Archives in Washington, DC, and the facility in College Park. We were pleased to receive more than 3,200 votes. Status of the redesign effort is posted on our internal web site and on *archives.gov,* with implementation of the web site scheduled for early FY 2011.

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	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Online visits to NARA's web sites (in thousands).	31,897	34,871	37,807	37,470	39,036
Performance target NARA web site scores as percent of benchmarked score for other Federal web sites.	–	–	*Establish baseline*	*67*	*72*
Percentage point improvement in web sites score.			–	3	5
Web sites score at or above the benchmark for excellence as defined for Federal government web sites.	69	67	66	69	74
Presidential Libraries score at or above the benchmark for excellence as defined for Federal government web sites.	77	77	75	78	79

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation To improve workflow we will implement *archives.gov* in a new content management system.

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, 90 percent of NARA's visitors are satisfied with their visit experience.
	5.2 By 2016, a minimum of 85 percent of NHPRC-assisted projects produce the results required, employing rigorous standards and milestones approved by the Commission.

FY 2010 Resources Available to Meet This Goal: $30,356,000; 190 FTE

5.1 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION WITH OUR PROGRAMS

FY 2009 Objectives	☐ 85 percent of NARA education program visitors are satisfied with their visit.
	☐ 85 percent of NARA exhibit visitors are satisfied with their visit.
	☑ 85 percent of NARA public program visitors are highly satisfied with their visit.
	☑ Implement priorities on recommended improvements identified through the AASLH study results.
	☐ Conduct and evaluate a longitudinal study of the Public Vaults and visitor experience to compare to 2005 data.
Results *"…your DocsTeach web site, great resource for teachers!"*	✔ We met the expectations of 99 percent of teachers rating our teacher education workshops.
	✔ Our National Archives Experience formally surveyed on-site visitors from July through October.
	✔ We met the expectations of 97 percent of visitors rating our public programs.
	✔ We implemented improvements to the logistics and descriptive content for exhibits in the Rotunda.
	✔ We developed a survey instrument for our longitudinal survey of the Public Vaults and visitor experience.

Discussion: This year, in response to the *OPEN Government Directive,* our Office of the Federal Register launched a new product, *Federal Register 2.0*, an unofficial online newspaper version aimed at making the *Federal Register* and participation in Federal rulemaking more accessible to the public. Development of *Federal Register 2.0* reflects a unique public/private partnership and use of web 2.0 technologies. The site's design incorporates greatly improved navigation and search tools and clearly highlights each agency's significant rules. The web site takes advantage of social media and integrates seamlessly with *Regulations.gov* and the Unified Agenda to facilitate the rulemaking process. Since the launch of *FederalRegister.gov* in July, more visitors are accessing the *Federal Register*—nearly 82 percent as new customers.

Throughout the year, we conduct monthly workshops with the public and Federal agency regulation writers to inform attendees about the Federal regulatory process embodied in the Federal Register Act and the Administrative Procedure Act. Our monthly workshop, *The Federal Register: What It Is and How To Use It,"* is a means of educating the public and Federal agency regulation-writers about the Federal regulatory process embodied in the Federal Register Act and the Administrative Procedure Act. Our purpose in conducting monthly workshops is to promote better understanding of the system, increase participation in the notice-and-comment process, and improve regulation-writing.

The Presidential Libraries host a variety of programs designed to educate and inform students about the presidency, American history, and our democracy. Our goal in FY 2010 was to develop a measurement tool for these education programs. We delayed the start of this survey as we rethink our agency-wide methodology for customer satisfaction surveys.

Our commitment to civic literacy extends to communities around the country. During the year, we opened a revolutionary exhibition – *Discovering the Civil War* – where an extensive display of our holdings was assembled to reveal numerous unknown facts about the Civil War; *and Mugged! Facing Life at Leavenworth* – a behind-the-scenes journey through the halls of the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas, from the 1890s to the 1930s.

In addition to conducting workshops and using videoconferencing to reach our audiences nationwide, we promoted civic literacy through one of our highly successful open government initiatives. *DocsTeach,* launched in September 2010, is an online tool for teaching with documents. The tool combines primary source content with the latest interactive capabilities of the Internet and provides instruction to teachers in the best practices of teaching with primary sources.

Improvements to the Rotunda were implemented as a result of feedback from the 2008 American Association of State and Local History (AASLH) study on museum and museum programs in Washington, DC. Customer feedback indicated that improvements to the logistics and content in the Rotunda would enhance their experience. In FY 2010, we implemented these improvements including audio information provided to lines external to the building, flat screen monitors staged in the Rotunda Gallery to provide more logistical and contextual information for visitors waiting in line to view the Charters of Freedom, and physical changes to the Rotunda exhibit to better inform visitors about the Charters of Freedom.

Efforts are underway to survey visitors to the *Public Vaults* exhibition. Due to a delayed start, we expect survey distribution to begin in FY 2011. In FY 2010, we successfully identified and selected a vendor to develop and distribute our customer satisfaction survey instrument and produce a statistical analysis report of the results. The survey results will help us better understand visitor behaviors and attitudes, especially corresponding to length of visit, visitor satisfaction, and visitor priorities. We will use these results to make adjustments in our service offerings that will improve the overall visitor experience.

Our customer service survey designed to help us understand customer satisfaction with our education programs, exhibits, and public programs. We use training evaluation forms and formal surveys to evaluate our programs; however, we do not yet have a process to collect these ratings agency-wide. We expect to deploy that capability in FY 2011.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Number of physical visitors to NARA museums, exhibits, research rooms and programs (in millions).	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.1
Percentage of NARA education program visitors satisfied with their visit.	—	—	—	—	*85*
NARA education program visitors satisfied with their visit.	—	—	—	—	—
Percentage of NARA exhibit visitors satisfied with their visit.	—	—	—	—	*85*
NARA exhibit visitors satisfied with their visit.	—	—	—	—	—
Percentage of NARA public program visitors satisfied with their visit.	—	—	—	—	*85*
NARA public program visitors satisfied with their visit.	96	96	97	97	97

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation We will work to improve our ability to evaluate customer satisfaction with our education and public programs agency-wide.

5.2 NHPRC-ASSISTED PROJECTS

FY 2010 Objectives ☑ 82 percent of all NHPRC-assisted grants produce the results required.

Results ✓ Nearly 92 percent of all NHPRC-assisted grants successfully reached their goal and produced the results expected.

Discussion: The National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC), a statutory body affiliated with the National Archives, supports a wide range of activities to preserve, publish, and encourage the use of documentary sources relating to the history of the United States. The NHPRC grant programs fund projects that promote the preservation and use of America's documentary heritage essential to understanding our democracy, history and culture.

In FY 2010, the NHPRC closed 123 grant projects with a 92 percent success rate. The NHPRC employs a rigorous competitive review process to determine which projects receive funds. Grant recipients come from a host of communities including colleges and

universities, state and local government archives, and nonprofit organizations. Grant projects typically range in duration from one to three years and therefore grants awarded in any given year will not yield results until the following year at the earliest. The NHPRC is challenged with managing grantee performance of typically more than 240 projects open at any given time. To meet the challenge of managing performance of ongoing projects at various stages in the grant process, the NHPRC will continue to seek ways to improve communication—specifically to applicants and grantees—about NHPRC programs, specific performance objectives, and general expectations of all Federal grantees to continuously improve our success rate.

In response to a Congressional committee report addressing concerns that the papers of America's Founding Fathers were not freely available online, we initiated our Founding Fathers Online pilot, *Transcribing and Encoding the Founders Papers for Online Access.* We initiated the Founding Fathers Online pilot project in FY 2009 to include the papers of John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Washington. In FY 2010, because of a grant awarded in 2009, we released 5,000 preliminary transcriptions of materials from President John Adams and James Madison to the public. In the first month of availability, there were more than 1,200 unique visitors for this selection of materials.

Performance Data	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Performance target for percent of all NHPRC-assisted grants produce the results required.	—	—	—	—	*82*
Percent of all NHPRC-assisted grants produce the results required.	88	86	81	82	92

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation We will continue a best test site of the "Founders Online" web site.

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 that of the Civilian Labor Force (CLF).

6.3. By 2016, 60 percent of NARA's positions are filled within 80 days.

6.4 By 2016, NARA's telework rate is 100 percent of the Federal Government average rate.

6.5 By 2016, public network applications are available 99 percent of the time.

FY 2010 Resources Available to Meet This Goal: $35,736,000; 184 FTE

6.1 DEVELOPING EMPLOYEES

FY 2010 Objectives

☐ Maintain 95 percent of staff development plans linked to strategic outcomes.

☑ Maintain 95 percent of employee performance plans linked to strategic outcomes.

☑ Identify core competencies for NARA's mission critical occupations.

Results

✔ We maintained 72 percent of staff development plans linked to strategic outcomes.

✔ We maintained 97 percent of employee performance plans linked to strategic outcomes.

✔ We developed a rollout plan for competency modeling that will extend to all mission critical occupations across all of NARA and management positions.

Discussion: Annually, we align employee performance plans and staff development plans to our agency's mission and strategic goals. These plans are important tools that document the connection between the work of an employee and how it ties, either directly or indirectly to the agency's mission, and in large part, to the *NARA* Strategic Plan.

Staff use the development plans to identify training requirements, navigate career paths, understand Government operations, or close or narrow skill gaps in core competencies.

Having the internal staff capabilities to execute the strategies in our strategic plan is vital to the success of the plan and the achievement of our mission. To ensure that we have the staff capacity that we need both now and in the future, we are systematically examining NARA's mission critical occupations to identify competency requirements at all levels.

For NARA, a competency model describes the set of skills, knowledge and abilities necessary for successful performance on a given job. Identifying and defining the core competencies required for the successful performance of NARA's mission critical occupations will establish the groundwork necessary for improving many human resource systems, including selection of new employees, promotion of employees, performance appraisal, training , succession planning and job design. Well-defined competency models mitigate legal exposure in hiring practices as well as increase efficiency, consistency, and continuity throughout our human resource systems.

In FY 2010, we hired a Personnel Psychologist with experience in competency modeling, selection, job design, and organization-based research, to drive the competency modeling initiative. Accomplishments throughout the year included the completion of competency modeling work initiated in FY 2009 for selected offices; developing a rollout plan for competency modeling to all mission critical occupations and management positions across NARA; and assessment content (competency usage plans, occupational questionnaires and structured interview guides) for more than 170 jobs that have gone through the competency modeling process to date.

Building on our efforts and using best practices in competency modeling will allow us to overcome challenges associated with such a large undertaking.

Performance Data	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
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.	76	96	89	67	72
Number of permanent staff having staff development plans that link to strategic outcomes.	1,970	2,366	2,221	1,741	1,922
Number of permanent staff who should have a staff development plan.	2,576	2,474	2,508	2,590	2,687
Average time (in calendar days) to fill a leadership position.	42	39	55	65	39
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.	95	97	98	96	97
Number of staff having performance plans that link to strategic outcomes.	2,530	2,480	2,510	2,570	2,737

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   NARA will continue to develop competency modeling and adhere to best practices that ensure high quality competency definitions and performance standards.

6.2 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

FY 2010 Objectives	☑	Increase the number of employees in underrepresented groups relative to their representation in the CLF.
Results	✓	The percent of employees in three underrepresented groups marginally increased in their representation rates.

Discussion: NARA strives to achieve a workforce that reflects the demographics of our nation's diverse workforce, an objective found in our Strategic Human Capital Plan, "Sustain a productive, diverse workforce and achieve results by valuing and recognizing performance in an environment in which all employees are encouraged to contribute." In our underrepresented groups (i.e. Women, Black/African American, Latino/Hispanic, Asian, Native Hawaiian /Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and persons with targeted disabilities), we achieved modest increases in representation in three groups – Asians, Latinos/Hispanics, and Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders. The percentage increases have been marginal for these groups.

We continue to focus on improving our performance in hiring and promoting people in underrepresented groups through efforts to expand recruiting techniques, analyze pertinent personnel information, and implement staff development programs. We will continue to assess our progress and remain diligent in our efforts to create a workforce more reflective of the diversity of our nation.

NARA's efforts in this area are guided by our annual Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) plan. The FEORP contains multi-year strategic goals that together form the foundation of NARA's recruitment strategy for women and minorities. These strategies focus on expanding partnerships with minority-serving universities, educations associations, and professional organizations; attendance and networking at minority conferences and job fairs; encouraging the use of developmental assignments; and making sure that these strategies are aligned with NARA's Strategic Plan. We finalized our FEORP and Federal Hispanic Employment Program plans and made them available to staff on our internal web site. Each plan addressed strategies for enhancing the representation of women and minorities, specifically Hispanic/Latinos at NARA. We conducted our 10-week Summer Diversity Internship Program where interns from underrepresented groups performed assignments in program offices, received training in applying for Federal positions, and became informed of possible Archivist Development Program (ADP) employment opportunities for which many will be qualified.

We created a directory of targeted recruitment sources, inclusive of colleges, universities and organizations with high concentrations of minorities and women that offer courses or professions applicable to NARA's Mission Critical Occupations (MCOs).

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Number of applicants.	5,040	4,690	5,559	6,353	2,769
Number of applicants in underrepresented groups.	1,790	1,744	2,515	2,808	647
Percent of applicants in underrepresented groups.	36	37	45	44	23
Number of qualified applicants.	2,315	2,857	3,099	3,727	1,576
Percent of qualified applicants in underrepresented groups.	53	42	52	48	31

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Number of best qualified applicants.	–	1,001	1,533	1,639	878
Percent of best qualified applicants in underrepresented groups.	–	51	52	48	27
Number of applicants hired.	256	236	334	309	135
Percent of applicants hired in underrepresented groups.	51	50	49	57	44
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) —Women —Black —Latino-Hispanic —Asian American/Pacific Islander —American Indian/Alaskan Native —Targeted disability	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   Improving performance in hiring and promoting people in underrepresented groups is an ongoing effort to achieve a workforce reflective of the society in which we live. We will develop a recruitment manual and training session for NARA's expanded outreach and recruitment efforts.

6.3 RECRUITING EMPLOYEES

FY 2010 Objectives   ☐   30 percent of NARA's positions are filled within 80 days.

Results   ✓   We filled 12 percent rate of NARA's positions within 80 days.

Discussion: The Presidential Memorandum ─Improving the Federal Recruitment and Hiring Process─ issued by the Obama Administration, directed agencies to overhaul the way Federal Government recruits and hires the civilian workforce. As part of the Administration's agenda to implement comprehensive recruitment and hiring reform, agencies were specifically required to improve the quality and speed of the hiring process.

An effective hiring process increases NARA's ability to reach the best talent in a competitive market. It mitigates the risk of lost opportunity, which happens when potential candidates accept positions elsewhere because of the lengthy hiring time. NARA's lengthy hiring process causes frustration among hiring managers who are waiting for positions to be filled. Managers can fulfill mission requirements when they can quickly tap into the talent seeking employment in the organization. An effective hiring process has numerous benefits.

The Federal standard for "time-to-fill" is 80 days, starting from the hiring manager's initial request to fill a vacancy to the employee's start date. NARA is committed to meeting this standard; however, we must work to improve our current status. In 2009, we mapped out our process and determined that it took on average between 163 to 213 days to fill a position.

The most significant barrier to NARA's ability to achieve timely hiring has been the lack of an automated staffing system to screen the hundreds of applications received for each NARA posting. Other barriers to timely hiring at NARA include an over-reliance on paper-based processes; lack of standardized position descriptions and assessments for NARA core occupations and other commonly filled jobs; lack of established interviewing and selection standards; and lengthy security clearance processing and drug testing processes.

This year, we expanded our pilot of an automated hiring solution, *USA Staffing*, and ensured that all human resources specialists were licensed, trained, and using the automated staffing tool on hiring actions. A USA Staffing manager joined NARA in FY 2010 to manage the overall USA Staffing implementation and ensure the execution of communications and training for all required users.

Employing a concerted six- month effort to attack a backlog of hiring action plans, we eliminated our backlog and are now operating with an acceptable workload. We completed most of the process changes identified in NARA's hiring reform action plan and have noticed a positive impact on reducing the "time-to-fill" for NARA's hiring actions.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Number of applicants.	5,040	4,690	5,559	6,353	2,769
Number of applicants hired.	256	236	334	309	135
Average number of days to fill position.	–	–	–	–	152.6
Performance target for percent of NARA's positions filled within 80 days.	–	–	–	–	*30*
Percent of NARA's positions filled within 80 days.	–	–	–	–	12

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation We will continue to improve the quality and speed of the hiring process.

6.4 NONTRADITIONAL WORK ARRANGEMENTS

FY 2010 Objectives ☐ 15 percent of NARA's eligible staff participates in the telework program.

Results ✓ Only 4 percent of NARA's eligible staff participates in the telework program.

Discussion: Non-traditional work arrangements are valuable tools to enhance the quality of employee work life. In addition, telework is a tool we can use to help recruit potential candidates, retain talented staff, and improve the productivity of our workforce.

We continue to support the integration of telework into agency operations. Our initial efforts to recruit a Work Life Wellness specialist, in FY 2010, to serve as NARA's Telework Program Manager, proved unsuccessful. We are re-evaluating our strategy for recruiting for the position; however, we have re-aligned an existing resource to assist with telework-related duties. In FY 2010, we issued guidance to establish NARA policy for using telework during pandemic flu or other emergencies and an agreement was drafted to expand telework opportunities to include telework for medical, long distance, Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP), or other emergency reasons.

A significant number of NARA's staff are ineligible to telework due to the nature of their work. For example, staff that handle classified materials or are in positions that require face-to-face personal contact, are ineligible to participate. We have a number of positions that limit nearly 72 of our staff from participation in the program. Of the remaining 28 percent of staff that are eligible, only 4 percent are participating. The causes behind this low participation rate will require further analysis; however; we anticipate that once key personnel are in place we will concentrate on enhancing NARA's organizational culture, and building management support towards the telework program. Our focus will be on improving communication and marketing next year. We are committed to expand this program to eligible staff and working with managers and staff to achieve NARA's stated goals.

Performance Data	2009	2010
Percent of eligible Federal Government workers who telework.	–	28
Performance target for percent of NARA's eligible staff in telework program.	–	*15*
Percent of NARA's eligible staff participating in the telework program.	–	4
Number of telework hours worked by NARA employees.	–	63,755

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation We will revisit our recruitment approach for a Telework Program manager and examine ways to increase participation among eligible staff.

6.5 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
FY 2010 Objectives ☑ Public network applications are available 98.85 percent of the time.

☑ Maintain and analyze NARA's agency-wide data dictionary that contains data modeling and physical implementation information for NARA's major mission-related systems.

Results ✓ Public network applications are available 99.6 percent of the time.

✓ NARA's data dictionary is updated quarterly with individual data models for NARA's mission-related systems currently in the system.

Discussion: 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). System upgrades and scheduled maintenance do require us to take systems off-line; however, we target off-peak times to lessen the impact to our customers.   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.

Many of the IT services that we provide depend on a robust network infrastructure to facilitate optimal performance. This becomes more crucial as we add applications and users to our network, increase our use of social media tools, and steadily increase the volume of digitized holdings. This year we upgraded the circuit that connects our intranet to the internet, increasing the speed from a traditional "T3" circuit running at 45 Megabytes per second (Mbps) to a fiber optic based circuit running at 100 Mbps with a potential bandwidth of 155 Mbps. This upgrade enhanced the experience of external users of NARA web sites as well as improved performance for NARA staff that access several internet-based business applications.

NARA's data dictionary provides us with the foundational tool to facilitate data sharing and continued development of data standards throughout the agency.   This year we increased the functionality in the data dictionary web site to enable report enhancements based on user requests and added a system to support the review and redaction of sensitive but unclassified documents.

Performance Data	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Percent of public network availability.	100	100	100	100	100
Performance target for percent availability of public applications.	*98.9*	*98.80*	*98.83*	*98.84*	*98.85*
Percent of public network applications availability.	98.9	99.4	99.5	99.5	99.6
Number of total hours that any public network application was unavailable.	830	504	424	414	305
Percent of customer's highly satisfied with NARA helpdesk services (average for year).	—	65	83	87	87

FY 2011 Performance Plan Evaluation   We will improve business productivity and customer service and support NARA's growing information and data needs with the deployment of the first phase of our enterprise Storage Network Infrastructure. To improve the performance of our IT infrastructure to meet business requirements, we will upgrade our Local Area Network (LAN).

FY 2010 PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Strategic Goal 1: Records Management

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 10-04, *Audit of NARA's Oversight of Electronic Records Management in the Federal Government,* April 2, 2010

> The objective of this audit was to determine whether established controls provide adequate assurance permanent electronic Federal records are identified, scheduled, and accessioned into NARA in fulfillment of NARA's statutory obligations. There are seven recommendations associated with this audit, six of which are in abeyance until a review of relevant statutory authorities, regulations, and responsibilities can be completed.

Strategic Goal 3: Electronic Records

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 10-08, *Management Letter: Award Fee Program for the Electronic Records Archives Development Contract,* March 24, 2010

> This management letter is to inform the 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.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 10-10, *Management Letter: Concerns with the Electronic Records Archives (ERA) System's Ability to Conduct Full-Text Searches,* April 2, 2010

> This management letter describes to the Archivist concerns with the capacity and capability of ERA to search the records it will eventually store.   There are no specific recommendations in this management letter.

Government Accountability Office, GAO-10-657, *Electronic Records Archives: Status Update on the National Archives and Records Administration's Fiscal Year 2010 Expenditure Plan,* June 11, 2010

> GAO objectives in reviewing the plan were to (1) determine whether NARA's FY 2010 expenditure plan satisfies the legislative conditions, (2) determine the extent to which NARA has implemented prior GAO recommendations, and (3) provide any other observations about the expenditure plan and the ERA acquisition. There are two recommendations associated with this report.

Strategic Goal 4: Access

Office of Inspector General, Report 10-06, *Management Letter: Security Conditions in the Research Rooms at the National Archives in College Park, MD*, March 15, 2010

This management letter describes to the Archivist security conditions found in multiple visits (both announced and unannounced) to National Archives at College Park research rooms. Although there are no specific recommendations associated with this management letter, we developed an action plan with 14 items, 10 of which remain open.

Strategic Goal 5: Civic Literacy

Office of Inspector General, Report 10-01, *National Historical Publications and Records Commission Grant No. 2004-026 Supreme Court Historical Society*, October 26, 2009

This review is part of a larger audit of NHPRC management controls over its grants process. This portion of the review was to determine whether (1) funds awarded were used and expended in accordance with Federal guidelines and (2) NARA objectives for issuing the grant were accomplished, specifically Grant No. 2004-026. There are no specific recommendations associated with this audit.

Office of Inspector General, Report 10-15, *National Historical Publications and Records Commission Grant No. RB-50061-09 Historical Society of Washington, DC*, June 23, 2010

This review is part of a larger audit of NHPRC management controls over its grants process. This portion of the review was to determine whether funds awarded and advanced to the Historical Society of Washington were used and expended in accordance with Federal guidelines. There are two recommendations associated with this audit, both of which remain open.

Strategic Goal 6: Infrastructure

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 10-02, *Cotton & Company, Independent Auditors Report on Internal Control,* November 2009

The Inspector General contracted with Cotton & Company (C&Co) to conduct an audit of NARA's FY 2009 financial statements. C&Co made 18 recommendations to correct matters involving internal control and operations. Five of these recommendations are closed, two are partially closed, and the remainder will carry forward to the next report.

Office of Inspector General, Report 10-05, *Review of NARA Contract for Information Technology and Telecommunications Support Services,* August 17, 2010

The objectives for this task order review were to determine if (a) the procurement of the Office of Information Services (NH) NITTSS task order was accomplished in accordance with the FAR requirements, and (b) NH officials adequately monitored contractor efforts to ensure the Government gets good value for the funds expended on the task order. There are six recommendations associated with this audit, one of which remains open.

Office of Inspector General, Report 10-07, *Audit of NARA's Network Infrastructure,* April 28, 2010

The objective of this audit was to determine whether NARA had effectively implemented appropriate physical security and access controls to protect network devices. There are 18 recommendations associated with this audit, 10 of which remain open.

Office of Inspector General, Report 10-18, *Management Letter: Security at Archives I and Archives II,* September 16, 2010

This letter defines the OIG's concerns regarding security offered to NARA staff, visitors, and holdings at the National Archives Building and National Archives at College Park facilities. There are no specific recommendations in this management letter.

Office of Inspector General, Report 10-19, *Audit of NARA's Internal Control Program,* September 16, 2010

The objectives of the audit were to (1) evaluate NARA's compliance with guidance contained in FMFIA and the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Circular A-123, *Management's Responsibility for Internal Control* (the Circular), and the adequacy of the agency's assurance statement and (2) identify and evaluate the system of internal controls using the Government Accountability Office's (GAO), *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government* (the Standards), for assessing and evaluating internal controls. There are two recommendations associated with this audit, both of which remain open.

Government Accountability Office, GAO-11-20, *National Archives and Records Administration Needs to Implement Key Program Elements and Controls,* DRAFT report for comment issued to NARA, September 16, 2010.

The objective was to determine whether NARA has effectively implemented appropriate information security controls to protect the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of the information and systems that support its mission. The final report is expected to be issued in early November.

Multi-Goal Evaluations

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 10-13, *Audit of the Accuracy of NARA's Performance Measurement Data,* May 18, 2010

The objective of this audit was to verify the accuracy and reliability of performance measurement data entered into NARA's performance management system, PMRS. There are two recommendations associated with this report, both of which remain open.

Office of Inspector General, OIG Report 10-14, *Audit of Process of Providing and Accounting for Information Provide to Researchers,* June 14, 2010

The objective of this audit was to determine whether controls were in place for ensuring requested records were properly accounted for when requested and returned to storage locations. There are four recommendations associated with this report, all of which remain open.

Government Accountability Office, GAO-11-15, *National Archives and Records Administration: Oversight and Management Improvements Initiated, but More Action Needed,* DRAFT report for comment issued to NARA, September 8, 2010

The objectives of this audit were to (1) assess NARA's effectiveness in overseeing the government-wide management of records, including commenting on its capacity to identify risk of unlawful destruction of Federal records; (2) describe its ability to preserve permanent records, and (3) assess its policies, procedures, and plans supporting key management and oversight capabilities: governance, human capital, and collaboration. The final report is expected to be issued in early November.

Office of Regional Records Services, *Program Review*, January 2010

The office conducted a program evaluation of the National Personnel Records Center, St. Louis. There were seven major findings and 19 minor findings associated with this report, all of which remain open.

Office of Regional Records Services, *Program Review*, May 2010

The office conducted a program evaluation of the Central Plains Region, Kansas City, MO. There were nine major findings and 23 minor findings associated with this report, all of which remain open.

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

The office conducted a program review of the Jimmy Carter Library in Atlanta, GA. The review resulted in 20 findings with responses due beginning in FY 2011.

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

The office conducted a program review of the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston, MA. The review resulted in 21 findings with responses due beginning in FY 2011.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Administrative Review*, April 2010

The office conducted a program review of the Ronald Reagan Library in Simi Valley, CA. The review resulted in 15 findings with responses due beginning in FY 2011.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Administrative Review*, May 2010

The office conducted a program review of the William J. Clinton Library in Little Rock, AK. The review resulted in 15 findings with responses due beginning in FY 2011.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Administrative Review*, August 2010

The office conducted a program review of the George W. Bush Library in Lewisville, TX. The review resulted in 21 findings with responses due beginning in FY 2011.

Office of Presidential Libraries, *Administrative Review*, September 2010

The office conducted a program review of the Lyndon B. Johnson Library in Austin, TX. The review resulted in 12 findings with responses due beginning in FY 2011.

Office of Administration, Security Management Branch, *Physical Security and Life Safety Inspection*, March 2010

The office conducted an inspection at the Great Lakes Region Records Center in Chicago, IL. There were no findings.

Office of Administration, Security Management Branch, *Physical Security and Life Safety Inspection*, March 2010

The office conducted an inspection at the Southwest Region Records Center in Fort Worth, TX. The inspection resulted in 28 findings, all of which remain open.

Office of Administration, Security Management Branch, *Physical Security and Life Safety Inspection*, April 2010

The office conducted an inspection at the Gerald R. Ford Museum in Grand Rapids, MI. The inspection resulted in one finding which remains open.

Office of Administration, Security Management Branch, *Physical Security and Life Safety Inspection*, May 2010

The office conducted an inspection at the Kingsridge Records Center in Dayton, OH. There were no findings.

Office of Administration, Security Management Branch, *Physical Security and Life Safety Inspection*, May 2010

The office conducted an inspection at the Dayton Records Center in Dayton, OH. There were no findings.

Office of Administration, Security Management Branch, *Physical Security and Life Safety Inspection*, June 2010

>   The office conducted an inspection at the Seattle Archives and Records Center. The inspection resulted in one finding that remains open.

Federal Records Management Evaluations

Under 44 U.S.C 2904(c)(8), the Archivist of the United States is required to report to Congress and the Office of Management and Budget (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 2010.

Records Management Achievement

In FY 2010, NARA presented Archivist Achievement Awards to the following agencies for demonstrated success in implementing effective records management tools or practices:

- Department of Interior, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians (OST), Office of Trust Records (OTR)
- Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)
- Department of State
- Department of the Treasury

OTR received its award to recognize their establishment and funding of records management courses at the Haskell Indian National University (HINU), in Lawrence, Kansas. The FBI received an award for the results achieved by its Document Inventory and Control Program (DIMCaP) in improving the management of closed case files. The Department of State was recognized for its long-standing commitment to ensuring that historical Federal records are identified, declassified, scheduled, preserved, and made available to the public. The Department of Treasury received an award for its approach to meeting the September 30, 2009, deadline for Federal agencies to schedule their electronic records as required in NARA Bulletin 2006-02.

Agency Records Management Self-Assessments

In 2009, we developed a methodology and a process for conducting and reporting oversight activities on Federal agencies' records management programs. This methodology includes inspections, agency self-assessments, surveys, studies, and other tools for collecting and reviewing information about Federal records management activities. NARA's annual records management self-assessment is one such oversight mechanism. The goal of the records management self-assessment is to measure how effective Federal agencies are in meeting the statutory and regulatory requirements for records management. The self-assessment is designed to gather data about agencies' records management policies and practices.

In late FY 2009, we conducted our first annual self-assessment as a pilot with a special focus on e-mail records management. We distributed questionnaires to 242 Federal agency Records Officers. We received 220 responses for a response rate of 91 percent. From our findings, we determined that 21 percent of Federal records management programs are at low risk for improper disposition of Federal records. NARA published

the report on the FY 2009 self-assessment on April 19, 2010
(http://www.archives.gov/records-mgmt/resources/self-assesment.html). We
transmitted the report to OMB, and to the Oversight and Appropriations committees in
both the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

In May 2010, we issued a second records management self-assessment. This time we
distributed the self-assessment to 270 Federal agencies and received 251 completed
responses for a response rate of 93 percent. The report on the FY 2010 self-assessment
will be published on the NARA website in early FY 2011. Based on the findings of the
2009 pilot, we modified and increased the number of questions in the 2010 self-
assessment to obtain more accurate data. In addition, the 2010 self-assessment included
questions pertaining to agency size and records management staffing levels.

Records Management Inspections

Under 44 U.S.C 2904(c)(7) and 2906, NARA is authorized to inspect the records
management programs of Federal agencies for the purpose of recommending
improvements. For several years prior to FY 2010, NARA did not conduct inspections,
choosing instead to review agency recordkeeping practices through informal visits and
other contacts.   In FY 2010, NARA determined that the renewal of the inspection
program would be mutually beneficial to Federal agencies and to NARA. NARA
decided to inspect one or two agencies annually and to target highly significant aspects
of their records management programs.

In 2010, NARA initiated records management inspections of two important components
of the Department of Defense: the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the
National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA). The NGA inspection will be conducted
in two phases. NARA will issue the inspection reports for both agencies, including
findings and recommendations, in FY 2011.

The following are the elements of the OSD and NGA programs that NARA's inspections
cover, including the reason for choosing these elements:

Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD):
- *Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence [USD(I)]* recordkeeping. The USD(I) is a
  highly significant office that was established recently and creates very important
  records.
- *Evault*, an "electronic archives" of email and other electronic files that is used by the
  OSD. Evault raises complex and far-reaching issues about how such files are
  managed.
- *Executive Archives,* also used by OSD, and other digital collections of scanned
  permanent records. These collections include a large volume of highly significant
  records.

National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA):
- *Hard copy mapping products* maintained at various NGA sites (Phase I of the
  inspection).
- *Digital mapping products* (Phase II of the inspection).

The NGA records associated with these mapping products are critical to carrying out
U.S. military actions, disaster mitigation efforts, and other significant actions. Many of

these records have been scheduled as permanently valuable but have not been transferred to the National Archives in a timely fashion.

Records Management Study

During FY 2010, NARA conducted a study on Federal web 2.0 and social media use. The purpose of the study was to gather information on how Federal agencies use web 2.0 tools to create and share information and how this might affect the value of the recorded information in the tools. Tools studied included internal and external blogs, wikis, social networking, and other collaborative web-based technologies. The study concluded that based upon function and use, records created should continue to be assessed based upon business, evidential, informational, and contextual values. It identified five major characteristics that may affect the value of the records and information maintained in these formats and also proposed several recommendations for future actions to improve the management of these types of records. In FY 2011, NARA plans to implement actions to address the recommendations. For more information about the FY 2010 records management study, please see http://www.archives.gov/records-mgmt/resources/web2.0-use.pdf.

Electronic Records Management

In FY 2010, 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 even though the September 30, 2009, deadline established by NARA in accordance with the Act has passed. NARA's continuing efforts to monitor agency electronic record scheduling progress (as described in NARA Bulletin 2010-02) 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 reported the results of Federal agency compliance with the E-Government Act in a separate report to Congress and OMB in FY 2010 (discussed in more detail in the following section).

In FY 2010, NARA continued to provide support to agencies to help them schedule their electronic records. For FY 2010, NARA set a goal to work with Federal agencies to schedule 873 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

As of September 30, 2010, NARA met 94 percent of this goal, and approved schedules for 820 electronic systems and series of records.

Summary Report of NARA's Electronic Records Project, FY 2004 – FY 2009 (including FY 2010 Updates)

NARA published its "*Electronic Records Project Summary Report, FY 2005-2009*" 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, and to transfer permanently valuable records to NARA. This report is available on the NARA website at http://www.archives.gov/records-mgmt/resources/e-records-report.pdf. While the report includes 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. Since the publication of the summary report, NARA has received updated information from Federal agencies regarding the status of their electronic records activities in FY 2010. These data are included below.

The E-Government Act of 2007 and NARA Bulletin 2006-02 formally established a Government-wide deadline of September 30, 2009, for agencies to submit records schedules to NARA for all their existing electronic records. As part of the Electronic Records Project, NARA requested status reports from agencies and tracked progress towards meeting this goal. In particular, NARA advised agencies to concentrate on scheduling electronic records supporting their core mission rather than records relating to administrative or housekeeping functions that are typically covered under NARA's General Records Schedules. By the September 30, 2009, deadline, NARA had received electronic records scheduling reports from 160 of 240 Federal agencies for a 67 percent response rate.

> *FY 2010 Update*: As of September 30, 2010, NARA received electronic records scheduling reports from 233 of 269 Federal agencies for an 87 percent response rate.

A closer look at the reported information and how it corresponds to the identified risk categories is described in more detail below:

Non-respondents: Thirty-three percent of 240 Federal agencies did not respond to NARA's requests for information. NARA is concerned with the high percentage of non-respondents and continues to work with agencies to improve this number, focusing primarily on advocacy and training. NARA recognizes that this is a resource-intensive activity for Federal agencies, and as such, NARA needs to make the reporting process simpler for agencies to complete, including developing tools such as templates or web-enabled forms to facilitate this task.

> *FY 2010 Update*: Thirteen percent of 269 Federal agencies did not respond to NARA's requests for information. NARA is encouraged that the percentage of non-respondents has decreased; however, we are concerned that large agencies such as the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) have not submitted status reports.

Low Risk Agencies: Forty-two percent of the agencies have submitted records schedules for 90percent or more of their e-records. For agencies in this category, it is less likely that e-records will be inappropriately managed or at risk of accidental or unauthorized destruction. Agencies that have taken the proper steps to identify and schedule their records have a better understanding of the information they create and maintain, and therefore, are better positioned to capture and preserve it. NARA needs to continue working with agencies to improve this percentage and promote full compliance with the E-Government Act requirements.

> *FY 2010 Update*: Forty-seven percent of Federal agencies have submitted records schedules for 90 percent or more of their e-records. This represents an increase above the FY 2009 percentage.

Moderate Risk Agencies: Eleven percent of the agencies have submitted records schedules for 60 to 89percent of their e-records. These agencies warrant continued monitoring and NARA assistance as needed to improve compliance.

> *FY 2010 Update*: Twelve percent of Federal agencies have submitted records schedules for 60 to 89 percent of their e-records. Based upon percentage, there has been no statistical change in this category.

High Risk Agencies: Fourteen percent of the agencies were categorized as high risk, having 59 percent or less of their e-records appropriately scheduled. NARA will continue to reach out to these agencies to learn more about their records scheduling activities and offer records management assistance as necessary. In certain cases, NARA will consider performing an on-site agency inspection to evaluate records management risks and other related areas of concern.

> *FY 2010 Update*: Nineteen percent of the agencies were categorized as high risk, having 59 percent or less of their e-records appropriately scheduled. These figures are a concern in that both the percentage and number of high risk agencies have increased across the Government. In particular, two agencies—the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)—have reported making no progress on scheduling their existing electronic records.

Electronic records scheduling. Between FY 2005 and FY 2009, NARA staff received and approved records schedules covering 2,404 series of electronic records. To improve the agency response rate and compliance percentage, NARA will continue to advocate for the scheduling and transfer to NARA of electronic records. Going forward, NARA will explore new strategies and partnerships to promote the goals of the Electronic Records Project. Though the September 30, 2009, deadline has passed, NARA views electronic record scheduling as an ongoing activity and will continue to provide oversight,

guidance, and training until all Federal agencies are compliant with the requirements in NARA Bulletins and the E-Government Act.

Electronic Records Transferred to NARA. As a result of NARA's targeted agency strategy, NARA was able to increase the volume of eligible permanent electronic records transferred to NARA. Also, as a result of the E-Records Project, NARA staff were invited to brief agency personnel concerning a wide-variety of electronic records transfer issues. NARA staff, and in particular the staff of the Electronic and Special Media Records Services Division (NWME) will continue advocacy efforts with agencies. In addition, NARA found that staff contacts with agencies concerning targeted transfers prompts agencies to review the transfer status of other records and transfer them as well if they are due.

Electronic Records Transferred to NARA

In FY 2010, NARA registered 192 transfers of permanent electronic records from 44 agencies and an additional accession of donated historical materials in electronic form. The table below lists the agencies, by their departments, that have transferred electronic records to the National Archives for permanent preservation in FY 2010.

Department	Agency	Transfers Received in FY 2010
Department of Agriculture	Agricultural Research Service	1
Department of Agriculture	Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service	3
Department of Agriculture	Foreign Agriculture Service	2
Department of Agriculture	National Agricultural Statistics Service	8
Department of Commerce	Census, Bureau of the	23
Department of Defense	Army Staff	1
Department of Defense	Defense, Office of the Secretary of	2
Department of Defense	National Geospatial - Intelligence Agency	3
Department of Defense	Naval Academy	10
Department of Education	Education, Department of	2
Department of Energy	Energy, Department of	1
Department of Health and Human Services	Administration on Aging	1
Department of Health and Human Services	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	56
Department of Health and Human Services	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services	2
Department of Health and Human Services	Health Resources and Services Administration	2
Department of Homeland Security	Federal Emergency Management Agency	1
Department of Homeland Security	Secret Service, U. S.	1
Department of Homeland Security	U.S. Coast Guard	5
Department of Homeland Security	U.S. Customs and Border Protection	1
Department of Justice	Federal Bureau of Investigation	3
Department of Justice	Law Enforcement Assistance Administration	3
Department of Labor	Employment and Training Administration	3
Department of Labor	Labor-Management Services Administration	4
Department of Labor	Mine Safety and Health Administration	1

Department	Agency	Transfers Received in FY 2010
Department of the Interior	Bureau of Land Management	2
Department of the Interior	Fish and Wildlife Service	2
Department of the Interior	National Park Service	1
Department of the Interior	Secretary of Interior	1
Department of the Treasury	Bureau of Public Debt	1
Department of the Treasury	Internal Revenue Services	1
Department of Transportation	Federal Aviation Administration	4
Department of Transportation	Federal Highway Administration	5
Department of Transportation	Federal Railroad Administration	1
Environmental Protection Agency	Environmental Protection Agency	21
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	1
Federal Communications Commission	Federal Communications Commission	1
Federal Reserve System	Federal Reserve System	1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	National Endowment for the Arts	3
National Science Foundation	National Science Foundation	1
Office of Personnel Management	Office of Personnel Management	2
Small Business Administration	Small Business Administration	1
Temporary Committees, Commissions, and Boards	Temporary Committees, Commissions and Boards	1
United States Tax Court	U.S. Tax Court	1
	Donation	1
	TOTAL	192

For FY 2010, NARA targeted a selection of disposition authorities from CFO Act agencies and their components that had permanent electronic records eligible for transfer in FY 2010. Of the transfers received in FY 2010, 183 came from CFO Act agencies. The table below identifies the CFO Act agencies from which we have received transfers in FY 2010, distinguishing the transfers that related to a targeted disposition authority from other transfers.

CFO Departments	Agency	Targeted Disposition Authorities for Accessions Received FY 2010	Transfers Received FY 2010 with Targeted Disposition Authorities	Transfers Received FY 2010 from Non-Targeted Disposition Authorities
Agriculture	Agricultural Research Service	0	0	1
Agriculture	Cooperative State Research Service	1	2	1
Agriculture	Foreign Agricultural Service	1	2	0
Agriculture	National Agricultural Statistics Service	7	7	1
Commerce	Census, Bureau of the	6	21	1

CFO Departments	Agency	Targeted Disposition Authorities for Accessions Received FY 2010	Transfers Received FY 2010 with Targeted Disposition Authorities	Transfers Received FY 2010 from Non-Targeted Disposition Authorities
Defense	Army Staff	1	1	0
Defense	National Geospatial - Intelligence Agency	3	3	0
Defense	Navy, Department of	1	0	0
Defense	Office of the Secretary, Dept Defense	2	2	0
Defense	U.S. Naval Academy	0	10	0
Education	Department of Education	2	2	0
Energy	Department of Energy	1	1	0
Health & Human Services	Administration on Aging	0	0	1
Health & Human Services	[former] Public Health Service	5	0	0
Health & Human Services	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	2	27	29
Health & Human Services	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services	0	0	2
Health & Human Services	Health Resources and Services Administration	0	2	0
Homeland Security	Customs and Border Protection	0	1	0
Homeland Security	Federal Emergency Management Agency	1	1	0
Homeland Security	Secret Service, U.S.	1	1	0
Homeland Security	U. S. Coast Guard	5	3	2
Interior	Bureau of Land Management	1	2	0
Interior	Department of the Interior	1	1	0
Interior	National Park Service	0	0	1
Interior	U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service	0	0	2
Justice	Federal Bureau of Investigation	0	0	3
Justice	Office of Justice Programs formerly *Law Enforcement Assistance Administration*	1	3	0
Labor	Employment and Training Administration	0	0	3
Labor	Labor-Management Services Administration	0	0	4
Labor	Mine Safety and Health Administration	1	1	0
Transportation	Federal Aviation Administration	4	4	0
Transportation	Federal Highway Administration	0	0	5
Transportation	Federal Railroad Administration	0	0	1
Treasury	Bureau of the Public Debt	1	1	0

CFO Departments	Agency	Targeted Disposition Authorities for Accessions Received FY 2010	Transfers Received FY 2010 with Targeted Disposition Authorities	Transfers Received FY 2010 from Non-Targeted Disposition Authorities
Treasury	Internal Revenue Services	0	0	1
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	2	14	7
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1	1	0
NSF	National Science Foundation	1	1	0
OPM	Office of Personnel Management	1	1	1
SBA	Small Business Administration	0	0	1
Total		**53**	**115**	**68**

Alleged Unauthorized Disposition of Federal Records

Under 44 U.S.C 3106, Federal agencies are required to notify the Archivist of the United States of any alleged unauthorized disposition of an 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 2010 cases are as follows:

Open cases, start of FY 2010:   23
Cases opened in FY 2010:   23
Cases closed in FY 2010:   18
Open cases, end of FY 2010:   28

Of the 28 cases open at the end of FY 2010, 10 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. Table 1 lists the 15 cases that are open and are pending action by the agency or review by NARA. Table 2 lists the 18 cases that were closed in FY 2010.

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	Pending agency response or follow-up
March 1999	**Dept. of Interior**, Bureau of Indian Affairs	Records of Crow Agency, Montana	Pending agency response or follow-up
July 2007	**Federal Labor Relations Authority**	Records of FLRA Chair	Pending agency response or follow-up
April 2008	**Dept. of Defense,** Office of Secretary of Defense	Video recordings of interrogations	Pending NARA review
May 2008	**Dept. of Defense,**	Video recordings of interrogations	Pending NARA review

Case Opened	Agency	Records	Status
	Defense Intelligence Agency	of terrorism suspect	
December 2008	**Dept. of Defense,** Office of the Secretary of Defense	Documents relating to torture issue	Pending agency response or follow-up
February 2009	**Dept. of Homeland Security**	Hard copies of Secretary's briefing books	Pending agency response or follow-up
August 2009	**Federal Trade Commission**	Consumer complaint letters	Pending agency response or follow-up
November 2009	**Dept. of Defense,** Office of Secretary of Defense	Email and electronic records of Coalition Provisional Authority, Iraq	Pending agency response or follow-up
November 2009	**Dept. of Veterans Affairs**	Records destroyed by flood	Pending agency response of follow-up
January 2010	**Dept. of Agriculture,** Food and Nutrition Service	Records relating to food stamp program	Pending NARA review
February 2010	**Dept. of Justice,** Office of Legal Counsel	Email records	Pending agency response or follow-up
March 2010	**Dept. of Interior,** Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians	Records at agency locations in western U.S.	Pending agency response or follow-up
June 2010	**Securities and Exchange Commission**	Matter Under Inquiry files	Pending agency response or follow-up
August 2010	**Dept. of Interior,** Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians	Records in agency facility in Albuquerque, NM	Pending agency response or follow-up

Table 2 covers cases of alleged unauthorized disposition that were closed in FY 2010. The table specifies those allegations that are founded, for which the agency takes corrective action to prevent additional unauthorized dispositions.

Cases closed in FY 2010

Case Opened	Agency	Records	Resolution
January 2003	**Dept. of Justice,** Federal Bureau of Investigation	Field office investigative case files concerning Leonard Peltier	Allegation not founded
May 2007	**Executive Office of the President,** Office of Administration	Federal records in White House e-mail system	Allegation founded-corrective action taken
July 2009	**National Aeronautics and Space Administration**	Procurement records at Ames Research Center	Allegation founded-corrective action taken
August 2009	**Dept. of Defense,** Defense Contract Management Agency	Records lost in fire in Ottawa, Canada	Allegation founded-corrective action taken
October 2009	**Dept. of Interior,** Minerals Management Service	Records destroyed by Wyoming State Audit Office employees	Allegation founded-corrective action taken
October 2009	**Dept. of Labor**	Electronic records	Allegation not founded
October 2009	**National Archives and Records Administration**	Cooperative source files of Drug Enforcement Administration	Allegation founded-corrective action taken
October 2009	**Social Security Administration**	Records destroyed by tsunami in American Samoa	Allegation founded-corrective action taken

Case Opened	Agency	Records	Resolution
November 2009	**Dept. of Agriculture,** Rural Development	Records destroyed by tsunami in American Samoa	Allegation founded-corrective action taken
November 2009	**Dept. of Justice,** Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys	Hard copies of Director's correspondence	Allegation founded-corrective action taken
December 2009	**Dept. of Interior,** National Park Service	Records destroyed by tsunami in American Samoa	Allegation founded-corrective action taken
January 2010	**Dept. of Defense,** Defense Intelligence Agency	Conditional Offer of Employment records	Allegation founded – corrective action taken
January 2010	**Dept. of Justice,** Federal Bureau of Investigation	HQ 157-164 case file	Allegation founded – corrective action taken
March 2010	**Dept. of Veterans Affairs,** Harry S. Truman Memorial Veterans' Hospital	Quality control records for nuclear camera	Allegation founded – corrective action taken
March 2010	**National Labor Relations Board**	Temporary case files	Allegation founded – corrective action taken
May 2010	**Export-Import Bank of the United States**	Copies of cables received from State Department	Allegation founded – corrective action taken
July 2010	**Dept. of Justice,** Federal Bureau of Investigation	Records in Police Training System	Allegation founded – corrective action taken
September 2010	**Dept. of Justice,** Federal Bureau of Investigation	Inspection working papers	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
Federal agency reference request	A request by a Federal agency to a records center requesting the retrieval of agency records.

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 Program review	An evaluation by the Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO) 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 13526. 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 or the application of file series exemptions approved by the Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel (ISCAP). The results of a declassification program review, along with any appropriate recommendations for improvement, are reported to the designated agency senior official for Executive Order 13526.
Equity-holding agency	An agency that may have classified information in a document, whether or not it created the document. Without providing a waiver for the declassification of its equities, only the equity-holding agency can declassify information in the document.

Goal 3	Electronic Records
Gigabyte	An International System of Units (SI) standard unit. A measure of computer data size. A gigabyte is one thousand megabytes, $1,000^3$ bytes. Referred to as gibibyte when using the International Electrotechnical Commission standard unit based on a multiplier of 1024 bytes as a measure for a Kilobyte.
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)	An International System of Units (SI) standard unit. A measure of computer data size. A megabyte is one million bytes, $1,000^2$ bytes.

	Referred to as mebibyte when using the International Electrotechnical Commission standard unit based on a multiplier of 1024 bytes as a measure for a Kilobyte).
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)	An International System of Units (SI) standard unit. A measure of computer data size. A terabyte is one million megabytes, $1,000^4$ bytes Referred to as tebibyte when using the International Electrotechnical Commission standard unit based on a multiplier of 1024 bytes as a measure for a Kilobyte.

Goal 4	Access
Artifact holdings	Object whose archival value lies in the thing itself rather than in any information recorded upon it.
Electronic holdings	Born digital 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   NARANET is the primary general support system of NARA, providing standard desktop applications, email and calendaring functions, network transport and Internet access to NARA staff and support personnel.

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/African American, Latino-Hispanic, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan Native); Women; People with Disabilities.