

28 APR 1971

AT

MEMORANDUM FOR:

SUBJECT : Comments on the IG Report on Information
Management in the Agency

AT

1. In addition to note of 12 April 1971, you may wish to consider the following comments in responding to the IG's request for our suggestions on subject report. Comments are keyed to paragraphs in the Records Management and Historical Records and Archives Sections of the report:

Paragraph 18, Page 36

This comment is indeed unfortunate in their conclusion that the principle occupation of the Agency Records Administration Officer is how to dramatize the need for additional storage space. Certainly we are preoccupied with many other elements of the Records Program and are actively working on microfilm projects, reports management projects and many other elements to reduce the paper flow. They are correct, however, that we have a long way to go in doing anything about a centralized control of records creation and establishing offices of record to cut down on duplication of files in our Records Center.

Paragraph 19, Page 36

This should more correctly read a staff of 6 officers and 3 clericals in the Records Administration Branch. Also we should note in this paragraph that there are 17 positions (records officers/analysts) in our Records Center

STA

Paragraph 20, Page 37

AT The statistics there are misleading in that the funds we receive for construction of additional storage space allowed for increased storage of 29,300 cu ft. [] and 16,500 ft. in [] This total of 45,800 cu. ft. new capacity was offset by the return to NARS of the 25,500 ft. of temporary storage space we had in Suitland. Hence, our actual net gain in capacity was 20,400 ft. However, our total Agency controlled capacity when these projects are completed will be 152,600 ft.

STAT

Paragraph 22, Page 38

I am confident you will recognize the inconsistencies in this paragraph. On the one hand they endorse the Agency policies that records programs be administered on a decentralized basis. On the other hand they say the components must depend on outside guidance in schedules and records retention and destruction programs. The statement made that [] provides little guidance nor does it make adequate provision for insuring that such guidance will be forthcoming should be followed by a statement that the components are not compelled to follow guidance given. As you know, guidance becomes a negotiable issue when we have a disagreement on how long we should keep records and where.

STAT

Paragraph 23, Page 38

Amen! But strengthening and broadening the functions of the Records Administration Officers must be preceded by increasing the staff and our capabilities to accept additional functions. I note that there is no reference to more manpower in this study.

Paragraph 24, page 38

This is a very fuzzy paragraph. First they say we should transfer the slots of full-time RMO's to the T/O of Records Administration Branch (without creating a career service to administer them) then they follow by saying that assignments of personnel to key RMO slots in the components should be coordinated with the Agency Records Administration Officer. Why be half pregnant? In any event, I agree it is a subject for further study.

Paragraph 25, Page 39

A very sound recommendation and one that I have been pushing all along. The Agency Records Management Staff (~~as~~^{if} properly staffed) should be dealing with senior officers in each of the components and not with Registry clerks.

Paragraph 27, Page 40

Well done! This appears to sprinkle holy water on our SIMC proposal and we might use this as ammunition in defending our concept paper when the time comes.

Paragraph 29, Page 41

AT The concepts stated in this paragraph may reflect component level thinking but certainly not an accurate reflection of and company.

Paragraph 34, Page 43

I think we should take strong exception to this approach on the Agency Archives Program. The IG's statement that they do not propose setting up a new T/O for this function and performing it by designating it as an additional duty is totally unrealistic and inconsistent with what ~~and~~ *they have* *concluded about* the Records Program. This is precisely what's wrong with our Records Program. There are too many "records officers" performing their records functions as an additional duty with the resultant sad state of affairs in our Records Programs. There is no reason to believe that any progress can be made on the Agency Archives unless we are prepared to commit several full-time positions to this effort and call on part-time help from others in the Records and History Programs.