[5] Programming changes can appear to work initially, but prove to have problems over a longer period of time. The Work Group specifically invites comments on whether 3 system cycles is sufficient for all administrative systems. Retention of basic programming information can be crucial with problems like the Year 2000 conversions. In contrast to item 3e which contains ''copies of master files or databases, application software, logs, directories, and other records needed to restore a system in case of a disaster or inadvertent destruction,'' 2d deals with the very basic operating system program. (2d is the frame and foundation of the house; 3e is the brick, aluminum siding, and drywall.)

[6] This is not the official contract file maintained by the agency procurement office and covered by GRS 3, item 3. Documentation pertaining to system requirements in the RFP, the language used by the vendor in proposals and quotes, and the benchmark/acceptance testing information can substantially impact assessment of vendor performance. Further, this can impact the specifications of future IT acquisitions.

[7] ISSUE: Should this item be deleted because GRS 3, Item 3, already covers all? Another alternative that has been proposed is to leave the description here, but provide a cross reference to GRS 3, Item 3c.

[8] Please see Schedule 18, Item 27.

[9] Items 3 f, g, and h could be collapsed into one item. Comments on the advisability of doing so are invited. For this draft, item 3f is separate because it focuses upon an individual user (for example, a procurement officer leaves the organization). Item 3g is a general log used to spot substantial differences in volume of traffic. Use of item 3g may trigger an audit of item 3f records (for example, a 40% increase in one unit's use may raise questions about why the increase; next step, a look at item 3f). Item 3h is a summary report, used for billing purposes.

[10] ISSUE: Can this retention period be easily applied? Is it appropriate for all administrative systems, including security-classified ones?

[11] Validity checks are routines in a data entry program that test the input for correct and reasonable conditions, such as numbers falling within a range and correct spelling, if possible. Valid transaction files are the reports of those validity checks.

[12] ISSUE: Disposition of item 4d is impossible to implement in the case of print files that are automatically generated and deleted by applications software. This may be a policy issue as to whether those files should be automatically deleted by the applications software.

[13] The disposition for Item 5a is for the operating system records; Item 2c covers the records for planning the system.

[14] In contrast to Item 2, which deals with systems application and development, Item 6 addresses end user support records.

[15] These logs can be invaluable in resolving customer complaints, providing appropriate follow-up service, and spotting problem trends in systems and networks.

[16] GRS 12, Communications Records, is under review and will have to be modified at a later date to address redundancies.

[17] Network installation records are included because the history of wiring in buildings, locations of switches, etc., has been a problem. Recent building renovations have revealed that agencies have unused phone lines, which are still live and costing money. Employees had moved to new offices, received new phone numbers, and never had the old phone lines disconnected.

[FR Doc. 98–19468 Filed 7–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515–01–P

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

Electronic Records Work Group Draft Report; Comments Requested

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

ACTION: Request for comment.

SUMMARY: This notice contains a working draft of the Electronic Records Work Group's proposed report to the Archivist outlining the Work Group's recommendations and the effort that went into developing the recommendations and implementation strategy. This draft has been modified slightly from the June draft that was posted on the Web and sent to agencies for review. This draft reflects the Work Group's decisions to use the term ''electronic source record'' to describe the records created using office automation applications and to place the discussion of program and administrative records, formerly in draft Appendix B, in the introductions to draft Appendixes C and D where they are most pertinent. For purposes of this review, we have not changed the Appendix designations that were used in the June draft and have, therefore, reserved Appendix B for a discussion in the final report of the public and Federal comments received on the draft products.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 20, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be sent electronically to the e-mail address <grs20@arch2.nara.gov>. We ask that lengthy attachments be sent in ASCII, WordPerfect 5.1/5.2, or MS Word 6.0 format. If you do not have access to e-mail, comments may be mailed to Electronic Records Work Group (NPOL), Room 4100, 8601 Adelphi Rd., College Park, MD 20740–6001, or faxed to 301–713–7270.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Miller at 301–713–7110, ext. 229.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The draft report appears at the end of this notice.

Dated: July 16, 1998.

Lewis J. Bellardo,

Deputy Archivist of the United States.

Draft Electronic Records Work Group Report to the Archivist of the United States

Table of Contents

Executive Summary
Introduction
Work Group Approach
Recommendations of the Electronic Records Work Group
Rejected Options
Future Steps
Appendix A—Electronic Records Work Group membership
Appendix B—[Reserved]
Appendix C—Proposal for developing agency records schedules that include office automation records
Appendix D—Proposal to revise the entire GRS to cover all formats of the administrative records included therein
Appendix E—Proposed General Records Schedule, Information Technology Records

Executive Summary

The Electronic Records Work Group (Work Group) is an interagency group formed by the Archivist of the United States on November 21, 1997, to review the 1995 version of General Records Schedule (GRS) 20, which was declared null and void by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. (That ruling is on appeal.) Specifically, the Work Group was asked to identify appropriate areas for revision, explore alternatives for authorizing disposition of electronic records, identify methods and techniques that are available with current technology to manage and provide access to electronic records, and recommend practical solutions for the scheduling and disposition of electronic records. The Archivist also gave the Work Group several guiding principles and policies, including: program records should not be scheduled in the GRS, electronic records should be scheduled as series, and solutions must be workable.

The Work Group membership was drawn from staff of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and other Federal agencies with records management and/or electronic records expertise under the oversight of Deputy Archivist Lewis Bellardo. Michael Miller, the Director of NARA's Modern Records Programs, serves as the group leader. In addition, electronic records management experts from state archives and records programs, the National Archives of Canada, academia, and records management consulting firms serve as consultants to the Work Group on a *pro bono* basis.

In conducting its review and developing the recommendations contained in this report, the Work Group aggressively sought input from Federal agencies, other interested

individuals and groups, and the general public. In addition to the public meetings held on December 19, 1997, and January 29, April 7, and May 18, 1998, NARA maintained a web page devoted to the work of the Electronic Records Work Group (http://www.nara.gov/records/grs20/); published public notices in the **Federal Register**; sent memos to Federal agency records officers asking for their comments at various points in the process; solicited comments from subscribers to the Archives Listserv and Records Management Listserv; and invited comments from professional organizations, such as the American Historical Association (AHA), Organization of American Historians (OAH), Society of American Archivists (SAA), National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators (NAGARA), Association of Records Managers and Administrators International (ARMA), and the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, and from other individuals with an interest or expertise in electronic records.

By March 1998 the group had drafted a number of options to be explored to replace GRS 20 disposition authorities, including authorities for the deletion of program and administrative electronic mail and word processing records, and for system maintenance and operations records. The group also explored options for electronic maintenance of electronic source records (records that remain in word processing and electronic mail and other office automation systems after a record has been produced for incorporation into an agency recordkeeping system) on an interim basis prior to the installation of proper electronic recordkeeping capability. After carefully considering the public and consultant comments on the preliminary options, the Work Group determined that there was only one feasible alternative approach to GRS 20, and that was to schedule the records at the series level.

The two other options initially proposed as possible approaches for managing electronic source records generated with electronic mail and word processing software were found to have significant flaws. Both options (to establish a uniform minimum retention period or to develop retention standards based on an individual's position in the agency's hierarchy) failed to meet requirements for the proper maintenance of records. Neither provided for proper organization or categorization of records to facilitate access. In both cases, disposition appeared to be based on factors other than business needs. The group could not identify supplemental measures that could be taken in conjunction with either of these options to make them useful.

The Work Group, therefore, recommends to the Archivist of the United States a three-part approach for scheduling the electronic source records that previously were authorized for disposal under GRS 20, items 13, 14, and 15. The Work Group's recommendations also address other concerns with the 1995 edition of GRS 20, i.e., authorization for the disposition of electronic source records produced with other office automation systems such as presentation software and electronic calendaring software, and authorization for the disposal of electronic records that correspond to the records covered in GRS 1–16, 18 and 23.

► First, agencies must schedule their program and unique administrative records in all formats. As part of its report, the Work Group proposes an implementation strategy to assist Federal agencies and NARA in accomplishing this task.

► Second, the Work Group recommends that NARA modify General Records Schedules (GRS) 1–16, 18, and 23 to authorize the deletion of electronic source records, including those generated with office automation systems, that correspond to administrative records covered by those GRS, after a recordkeeping copy has been produced.

► Third, the Work Group recommends that NARA develop a new General Records Schedule that covers only systems administration (or systems management) and operations records, such as files related to system use and maintenance, backup tapes, and other records (e.g., system user access records) used in managing information systems throughout their life cycle. This new GRS would cover records in all media.

The Work Group originally conducted a preliminary review of issues facing agencies that want to move toward electronic recordkeeping, but determined that working simultaneously on the scheduling approach and the electronic recordkeeping approach was not feasible given the deadlines and the complexity of electronic recordkeeping issues that need to be studied. The Work Group recommends that the Archivist establish a follow-on group that continues to work on electronic recordkeeping. This follow-on group should recommend guidance on electronic recordkeeping for Federal agencies.

Introduction

The Archivist of the United States established an interagency Electronic Records Work Group on November 21, 1997. In his charge to the Work Group, the Archivist asked the group to:

► Review the current version of General Records Schedule (GRS) 20;

► Identify appropriate areas for revision;

► Explore alternatives for authorizing disposition of electronic records;

► Identify methods and techniques that are available with current technology to manage and provide access to electronic records; and

► Recommend practical solutions for the scheduling and disposition of electronic records.

The Work Group was asked to develop and weigh advantages of various options and assess the practicality and feasibility of each in light of the availability of electronic records management tools and other resources. The Archivist asked the Work Group to keep in mind the following working assumptions in performing its work:

► General records schedules should focus on administrative ''housekeeping'' records, not program records, and there should be guidance in place to distinguish between them.

► Records may be transferred from one medium to another; however, key information about those records must be preserved as part of the transfer process.

► Electronic records should be scheduled as series, not classes of media.

► Solutions to electronic records challenges must be workable and be something agencies can and will use.

The Work Group membership was drawn from NARA staff and representatives of other Federal agencies with records management and/or electronic records expertise under the oversight of Deputy Archivist Lewis Bellardo. Michael Miller, the Director of NARA's Modern Records Programs, serves as the group leader. In addition, electronic records management experts from state archives and records programs, the National Archives of Canada, academia, and records management consulting firms serve as consultants to the Work Group on a pro bono basis. A list of the Work Group members and consultants is provided in Appendix A to this report.

Throughout this report, the term ''electronic source record'' has been used to describe the electronic record that resides on an agency's electronic mail, word processing, or other office

automation systems, i.e., the ''copy'' that formerly was authorized for disposal by GRS 20 after a recordkeeping copy was produced. This report addresses the disposition of the electronic records which are the sources of the records filed in the agency's recordkeeping system. Therefore these records are designated as ''electronic source records.'' Agencies need to recognize that records created using word processing, e-mail and other software on office automation systems must be scheduled according to the same requirements which apply to all records. NARA will authorize the disposal of electronic source records in office automation systems only when copies of these records have been captured in a recordkeeping system.

A main thrust of this report is to provide guidance and techniques to agencies for scheduling electronic source records that are created using word processing, electronic mail, and other end-user software. These records typically are stored in desktop and laptop computer systems and in networked servers. In the modern Federal office environment, most staff members are provided with generic software tools, such as word processing and e-mail, which they use to generate electronic records related to their work, regardless of the nature of the work. These records need to be filed in a recordkeeping system so that they will be retrievable with other related records such as attachments, the corresponding incoming or outgoing record, and, if part of a case file, the forms and other records that comprise that file. The complete files, and individual records within them, need to be accessible to other staff members who need them in the course of their work and in response to inquiries from the public. Failure to place electronic records generated as electronic mail messages, word processing files, and other office automation products in a recordkeeping system will result in files which are incomplete or unreliable. Consequently, these electronic source records must be copied to a recordkeeping system established by the agency for maintenance, use, and disposition.

However, even after these records are placed in a recordkeeping system, a record remains on the originating system. These electronic source records, like other Federal records, can be destroyed (deleted from the office automation system) only with NARA's authorization. The Work Group proposes that NARA revise the GRS to provide governmentwide authorization for the disposition of electronic source records used to create the types of records covered by GRS 1-16, 18, and 23. Agencies must obtain authorization for disposition of all other electronic source records by submitting a schedule (Standard Form 115) to NARA.

The Work Group considered using terms other than ''electronic source record'' but found them problematical. Some readers saw ''electronic copy'' as implying nonrecord status. The term ''version'' is often used to distinguish between a paper record and the same record in electronic form. However, ''version'' is frequently used to describe a record that is an iteration of an earlier or later record. Hence, ''version control'' may be a feature of a document management or electronic recordkeeping system, to distinguish between the first record produced and later variants of the same record.

Conversely, the Work Group chose not to use the term ''duplicate'' because that term implies an exact match which may not exist. The electronic source record that resides in an individual's word processing directory or electronic mail box would be a duplicate of the record in the recordkeeping system only if the recordkeeping system were electronic and if all of the metadata produced by the word processing or electronic mail utility were transferred to the recordkeeping system. Because so many agencies are still maintaining paper files as their recordkeeping systems, use of the term ''duplicate'' would be inappropriate.

Work Group Approach

In conducting its review and developing the recommendation and products contained in this report, the Work Group made special efforts to engage the Federal community and the public in discussion of possible alternatives to the 1995 General Records Schedule 20, and to keep them informed of the Work Group's activities. A GRS 20 web page on NARA's Internet web site at <http://www.nara.gov/records/grs20/>, and a special e-mail address (grs20@arch2.nara.gov) was established. Posted on that web page were documents for public comment, meeting notices and agendas, summaries of public meetings, and other background materials relating to the Work Group and the *Public Citizen* v. *Carlin* litigation. Notices of public meetings and information about documents for public comment were published in the **Federal Register**. Information and requests for comment also were provided to Federal agency records officers through NARA memos and to subscribers of the Archives Listserv and Records Management Listserv through electronic messages.

The Work Group's first public meeting was held on December 19, 1997, at NARA's Archives II facility in College Park, MD, with one member and several consultants participating by teleconference. The purpose of the meeting was to bring the members of the Electronic Records Work Group and consultants together to outline the tasks and to answer questions concerning the logistics of the Work Group. The Work Group and consultants received a set of detailed preliminary issues proposed for discussion and other background materials. The list of preliminary issues was posted on the GRS 20 Page and also published for public comment in the **Federal Register** on December 24. Comments were received from Work Group members and consultants and a Federal agency contractor by the January 9, 1998, deadline. In an effort to obtain wider input on the list of issues and options the Work Group should consider, a second public meeting was held on January 29, 1998, at the National Archives Building in Washington, DC. More than 70 Federal agency staff and interested members of the public attended. Two Federal employees provided formal remarks, and a number of individuals, most from Federal agencies, made comments from the audience.

Immediately following the public meeting on January 29 and continuing on February 9, 1998, the NARA members and Federal members of the Electronic Records Work Group held working sessions at the National Archives Building in Washington, DC, to discuss alternatives for GRS 20. The members discussed the framework in which they were working, ranging from the goals of the group to the current status of electronic records management in the Federal government. The members also discussed the comments submitted by members of the public and brainstormed on possible alternatives to GRS 20. From these comments and ideas, the Work Group developed three possible short-term approaches for scheduling electronic records for further analysis and review. These were described in the March 12, 1998, paper ''Preliminary Options for Replacing GRS 20.'' The Work Group's consultants, who had reviewed a draft of the paper, were asked to provide their views on enabling requirements and related issues for specific options, and to comment on any other aspect of the paper. Work Group members also developed comments on specific options.

The Preliminary Options paper laid out three options. The first option, based on a traditional approach to

scheduling records by series, had three complementary sections for scheduling program and administrative records, revising GRS 20 to cover only systems records, and revising the remaining GRS to provide disposal authority for source records not needed for recordkeeping. The second and third options offered alternative interim approaches for handling the disposition of electronic source records that remain on electronic mail and word processing systems. Option 2 involved saving electronic source records for a specific minimum period of time and option 3 proposed saving the electronic source records created or received by individuals holding specific positions within an organization.

Public input on the options paper and suggestions for additional approaches were sought in a variety of ways. The paper was posted on the GRS 20 Page as <http://www.nara.gov/records/grs20/opt312.html> on March 14, and a notice announcing the availability of the paper and requesting comments was published in the **Federal Register** on March 19, 1998. NARA sent a memo to Federal agency records officers and information management officials on March 13 (NWM 06–98) inviting comments on the paper. Announcements were sent to the Archives Listserv and Records Management Listserv, and messages were sent by e-mail or fax to individuals interested in electronic records issues and to professional organizations, including the American Historical Association (AHA), Organization of American Historians (OAH), Society of American Archivists (SAA), National Association of Government Archivists and Records Administrators (NAGARA), Association of Records Managers and Administrators International (ARMA), and the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History. Comments were requested by March 31.

Public comments were received from eight individuals and the Small Agency Council Records Officers Committee. None suggested additional approaches although several commented on aspects of the entire GRS and on GRS 20 coverage. Option 1 was generally preferred.

Most of the Work Group's consultants submitted comments on all of the options and issues. No other short term options were identified. Several comments offered other approaches to appraising records (a systems or macro approach, the Canadian model, the Pittsburgh Project ''warrant'' concept). Given the time frame that the Work Group had to develop its recommendations, these approaches were not pursued; however, they deserve further review later. The consultants found options 2 and 3 problematic.

Copies of all of the comments received were circulated to the Federal members of the Work Group and to the consultants prior to an all-day public meeting on April 7 at the Office of Thrift Supervision Amphitheater in Washington, DC. All but two Work Group members attended the meeting, as did five of the 8 consultants. The meeting was called specifically to receive comments from the ERWG's consultants on the March 12, 1998, Options Paper, but the meeting was opened to the public and approximately ten persons observed all or part of the meeting. Most of the consultant comments and discussion focused on Option 1, and they agreed that options 2 and 3 lacked merit. No additional options were identified.

The Work Group met in a working session on April 17 to evaluate further the written comments and discussions at the April 7 meeting and to make assignments for developing products to implement Option 1. Several consultants were asked to contribute to those products and other consultant and agency/public comments were incorporated in the approaches where feasible. A fourth public meeting was held on May 18, 1998, at the National Archives Building in Washington, DC, to brief Federal agencies and the public on Work Group's progress and to obtain public comments and questions. In addition to the **Federal Register** notice and memo to records officers and IRM officials announcing the meeting, invitations were sent to the Chief Information Officers (CIO) Council, plaintiffs in the *Public Citizen* versus *Carlin* litigation, and other organizations and individuals. More than 200 people attended the meeting and provided a number of comments and questions.

As the Work Group discussed in the May 18 public meeting, the report and its appendixes were sent to Federal agencies for comment in June and a copy of the report, without the appendixes, was posted on the GRS 20 Page at that time. The Federal members of the Work Group met on July 13 to discuss changes and clarifications needed in the report and appendixes that would be published in the **Federal Register** for public and formal Federal agency comment the week of July 20. The Work Group and its consultants will review the comments received and prepare a final report and implementation plan to the Archivist of the United States in time for his review and approval before September 30, 1998.

Recommendations of the Electronic Records Work Group

The Electronic Records Work Group recommends to the Archivist of the United States that NARA take the following actions to replace the 1995 General Records Schedule 20:

1. NARA should instruct agencies to schedule their program and unique administrative records in all formats.

On March 10, 1998, NARA issued such instructions in NARA Bulletin 98–02, Disposition of Electronic Records, for new and revised series that are submitted to NARA for approval. NARA should issue instructions for scheduling the electronic source records generated with office automation systems that were authorized for disposal under the 1995 GRS 20.

If the scheduling process to replace the disposition authority formerly provided by GRS 20 is to move ahead expeditiously, it is essential that the process must both minimize the burden on Federal agencies as much as possible and continue to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed schedules through the usual **Federal Register** process. In carrying out the proposed scheduling process, agencies must perform a series-based review of their schedules, NARA must appraise proposed dispositions on a series basis, and the public must have the opportunity to comment on proposed dispositions on a series basis. However, the Work Group does not believe that it is necessary, at this time, for agencies to submit individual schedule items for these electronic source records series by series. As agency records schedules are revised or amended, the disposition authorities for these electronic source records will be integrated into the agency disposition manual at the series level.

The Work Group has developed Appendix C to facilitate implementation of this recommendation. Appendix C proposes guidance to agencies on how to develop records disposition schedules to replace the dispositions formerly provided by GRS 20 and outlines in a general manner how those proposed schedules will be processed by NARA.

2. NARA should modify General Records Schedules (GRS) 1–16, 18, and 23 to authorize the deletion of source records corresponding to the administrative records covered by those GRS that are not needed for recordkeeping purposes, after a recordkeeping copy has been produced.

Proposed language and a discussion of the recommendation is provided in Appendix D, along with definitions of ''program records'' and ''administrative records.'' The definitions should be added to the general records management definitions in NARA regulations at 36 CFR 1220.14, and where appropriate in other NARA records management guidance.

3. NARA should revise GRS 20 disposition authorities to cover only systems administration (or systems management) and operations records, such as files related to system use and maintenance; backup tapes; and other records (e.g., system user access records) used in managing information systems throughout their life cycle. The new schedule should cover only administrative records, but should cover them in all media.

A proposed draft general records schedule is provided in Appendix E. This draft has been modeled after the New York State Archives and Records Administration (SARA) General Administrative Schedule's section on Electronic Data Processing, but adapted to reflect the mandatory nature of the General Records Schedules. (The New York General Administrative Schedule is advisory and provides minimum retention periods.) The New York SARA approach was developed with the assistance of the State government data processing community. The Work Group emphasizes that this draft revised general records schedule will need to be reviewed carefully by Federal agency CIO's and their information technology (IT) organizations to ensure that it accurately describes Federal IT records and includes only temporary administrative records that can be scheduled by a common disposition authority in a GRS.

Rejected Options

In early deliberations, the Electronic Records Work Group considered two other options for maintaining electronic source records used to generate some or all program records.

Those options, numbers 2 and 3 in the Preliminary Options Paper dated March 12, 1998, were:

- *Establish a uniform minimum retention period for electronic records currently covered by GRS 20, items 13 and 14*
- *Develop retention standards for electronic records currently covered by GRS 20, items 13 and 14, based on an individual's position in agency hierarchy*

These options were proposed as possible approaches for maintaining electronic source records of all or some of the most important agency program records created or maintained on e-mail and word processing systems. In discussing these two options, Work Group members came to the conclusion that they were significantly flawed. Both options failed to meet requirements for the proper maintenance of records. Neither provided for proper organization or categorization of records to facilitate access. In both cases, disposition appeared to be based on factors other than business needs. (Business needs refers to an agency's need to conduct its business, maintain a record of its essential activities and decisions for its own use, support oversight and audit of those activities, and permit appropriate public access.) The Work Group could not identify supplemental measures that could be taken in conjunction with either of these options to make them useful.

A significant concern with both approaches was that they might be viewed by agencies and the public as a satisfactory interim way to manage records electronically until the agencies have fully functioning electronic recordkeeping systems. Such electronic collections of mail and word processing records are incomplete, without proper recordkeeping organization, and unindexed. Moreover, they lack the context of the related documentation filed in the recordkeeping system. Access to such collections is limited to full text search, which has the dual drawbacks of finding many irrelevant documents and missing key documents that may not contain the word(s) used in the query.

An additional concern with option 2 was that some agencies may believe that this option could be implemented by retaining backup tapes for a minimum period of time. As stated in NARA regulations (36 CFR 1234.24(c)) and guidance (the 1995 Agency Recordkeeping Requirements: A Management Guide), backup tapes should not be used for recordkeeping purposes for a variety of reasons. One compelling reason is that records on backup tapes are not readily accessible to agency staff members. While necessary for disaster recovery, backup tapes are not useful for day-to-day agency operations.

The proposed option 3, to retain electronic source records generated with mail and word processing systems based on organizational position, was a variation of rejected option 2 and seemed to be based on archaic archival and records management theory. Work Group members and other NARA staff believe that setting retention periods based on hierarchical placement would not produce useful results. At one time, appraisal theory assumed that records of high level officials were generally more valuable than records in lower level offices, as significant program decisions are reached at the higher levels. Over many years, NARA has found that in many agencies much of the documentation of policy development and justification is maintained at lower-level program offices of an agency. Currently, appraisal of Federal records is conducted by assessing the documentation patterns in agencies and identifying the most valuable records based on function and recordkeeping practices, as well as content.

Finally, Work Group members recommended against these options because implementation of either would drain records and information management resources from more productive efforts to control agency records properly, including long-term plans to move toward electronic recordkeeping.

In conclusion, the Electronic Records Work Group, after careful deliberation, rejected options 2 and 3 in the Preliminary Options Paper dated March 12, 1998, as unworthy to be included in the recommendations to the Archivist.

Future Steps

This report of the Electronic Records Work Group addresses the recordkeeping practices of most agencies, which are still primarily paper-based. However, business needs and technology advances will lead agencies to electronic recordkeeping over time. The many Federal initiatives for electronic commerce and the reliance on computer technology to create the records that document government business are examples of the forces moving most agencies in this direction. NARA must provide guidance to agencies on sound policies and techniques for managing electronic records and for implementing electronic recordkeeping systems.

The Work Group recommends that the Archivist establish a follow-on group to look at the electronic recordkeeping issue and to make recommendations in that area. The follow-on group should begin as soon as possible and build on the work done by this Work Group. The Work Group suggests that the Archivist should set a relatively short time frame for submitting these electronic recordkeeping recommendations.

Appendix A: Electronic Records Work Group Membership

Members—National Archives And Records Administration

Lewis J. Bellardo, Deputy Archivist of the United States
Michael L. Miller, Director, Modern Records Programs
Nancy Allard, Policy and Communications Staff
Mark Giguere, Modern Records Programs
Jean Keeting, Modern Records Programs
Miriam Nisbet, Special Counsel for Information Policy
Susan Sallaway, Information Resources Policy and Projects Division
Kenneth Thibodeau, Director, Electronic Records Programs

Members—Other Federal Agencies

Edward Barrese, Records Officer, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
Maya Bernstein, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget
Elizabeth Behal, Departmental Records Officer, U. S. Department of Agriculture
Christopher L. Olsen, Chief, Records Classification and Management, Records Classification and Management Group, Office of Information Management, Central Intelligence Agency
Dan Hocking, Computer Scientist, Army Research Laboratory
Eleanor Melamed, Department of Energy
Alan Proctor, CIO Council Liaison, Department of the Treasury
Catherine Teti, Director for Records Management and Information Policy, Office of Thrift Supervision

Non-Federal Expert Consultants

Rick Barry, Barry Associates
Luciana Duranti, University of British Columbia
Bruce Evans, Nuclear Information and Records Management Association (NIRMA)
Margaret L. Hedstrom, University of Michigan
James Henderson, State Archivist, Maine
Alan Kowlowitz, New York State Archives and Records Administration
John McDonald, National Archives of Canada
Charles Robb, Kentucky Department for Library and Archives
Robert Williams, Cohasset Associates

Appendix B [Reserved]

Appendix C—Proposal for Developing Agency Records Schedules That Include Office Automation Records

Note: See the second document published in this Part V of the **Federal Register**.

Appendix D—Proposal To Revise the Entire GRS TO Cover All Formats of the Administrative Records Included Therein

Note: See the third document published in this Part V of the **Federal Register**.

Appendix E—Proposed General Records Sechedule, Information Technology Records

Note: See the fourth document published in this Part V of the **Federal Register**.

[FR Doc. 98–19469 Filed 7–20–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515–01–P