MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Support

SUBJECT   : Records Management Program - Policies Issues -
                  Organizational Structure

1. Paragraph   of this memorandum contains recommendations for your approval.

2. Before 1961 responsibility for the Records Management Program was centralized in the Records Management Staff. In 1961 responsibility for establishing, maintaining, and directing records programs was assigned to the Deputy Directors and heads of independent offices. Decentralization was not absolute, however, because the function of the CIA Records Administration Officer was retained with a minimal central staff. He is charged with responsibility for furnishing staff guidance, assistance, and coordination of the Agency program, and for reviewing and monitoring the decentralized programs. Neither the centralized program that existed before 1961 nor the structure that has existed since has adequately fulfilled the fundamental requirement of controlling the growth of inactive record material maintained in the offices and stored at the Records Center.

3. The reasons the centralized program didn't work before 1961 are still valid and it appears that no useful purpose would be served by considering total centralization as a reasonable alternative now. There are also several reasons the program as established after 1961 hasn't worked either:

SECRET

a. The present regulation governing the Records Program,

[   ] is ambiguous. It says there will be an Agency Records   25X1

Program composed of decentralized programs and this is the begin-

ning of the ambiguity. It is not clear how one program is expected

to be constructed out of several. The ambiguity is intensified by

the distribution of authority and responsibility. ~~All of the~~

authority to establish, maintain, and control LOCAL records programs

is delegated to the Deputy Directors and/independent offices and (heads of)

none is reserved for the "Agency program". The Agency Records

Administration Officer (Chief, Records Administration Branch, SSS)

is made responsible for furnishing staff guidance, assistance,

and coordination of the "Agency program" but there is no require-

ment that these services be used. He is responsible for "re-

viewing and monitoring", but there is no obligation to accept or

respond to his comments and recommendations. The regulation

seems to say that the Agency wants it both ways: decentralized

programs but centralized control. A part of the problem is that

there is no authority and no structure to make it work either

way or in combination.

b. A second reason the program doesn't work effectively

now is that we operate a central storage facility but exercise

no control over what comes into it, how long it must be kept,

or when and if it may be destroyed. Each of the decentralized

authorities exercises~~this~~ these controls and jealously guards

right to do so. Theoretically, completely decentralized programs would include provision for separate storage facilities for each program. Clearly this is too outrageous to consider seriously but it does suggest that perhaps some central control should be exercised over the use of the Records Center, particularly if the managers of the Records Center are to be held accountable for volumes retained, and charged with responsibility for reducing them to a proportion which will fit within the present space.

c. A third reason the Records Program doesn't work is that storage is the only element of the Records Programs that attracts attention, and even then ~~they~~ *it* only gets attention when the available space is used up. Other elements of the Program do not get attention because there is almost never a crisis which can be directly attributed to them. Managers like to have their records programs remain unobtrusive. They ~~prex~~ prefer to let subordinates deal with problems of correspondence, reports, forms, and records maintenance. There are no ~~rr~~ effective and systematic management systems to deal with reports or forms in any of the records programs in the Agency Components yet computer produced reports are literally transported from computer centers on fork-lift trucks and external printing of official forms costs the Agency more than a quarter of a million dollars a year. We have no way of knowing how much is spent or how much record material is produced for ultimate storage through

3

the uncontrolled development and printing of unofficial, bootleg

forms that are used in virtually every operation of the Agency.

We have no Agency correspondence program and no control over

copying machines yet these are probably the primary sources for

the creation of records that will ultimately require storage.

Moreover, there is no evidence that Agency management wants pro-

grams in ~~the~~ these vital elements of records management and control,

yet until we find some systematic way of dealing with the elements

of records creation we have no hope of dealing intelligently with

storage and disposal.

     d. The Agency last issued reports and forms handbooks

more than ten years ago and the correspondence manual was last

published in 1955. They are ~~hopelessly~~ out of date but the only

demand for revision comes from the Clerical Training Faculty

where they can be used as tools in teaching new clerical employees

some of the fundamentals. Efforts to revise these publications

in recent years have repeatedly bogged down in the coordination

process because it has proven impossible to get agreement among

the various echelons of management on the basic principles of

uniformity and standardization. Reports are generated by subor-

dinates to give the managers what they think he wants, not to

give him what he says he really needs. Management attitudes

toward correspondence are very largely esthetic and practices

followed in different components are usually developed in terms

of what is appealing to the eye of the senior manager or one of

his closely associated subordinates. ~~Elements of cost, efficiency,~~

~~and effectiveness and real need versus nice-to-have are not~~
~~readily apparent to the individual manager.~~ The return to be
gained from uniform practices and the application of professional
standards are not/impressive in the individual organizational
[above "not/": so]
unit that they become effective selling points in attempting to
persuade the manager that a ~~practical~~ practice should be adopted.
[above "practical": particular *proper and le*]
The fact that a bloc format justified flush left (the Federal
Government standard) will save several seconds of a typist's time
by eliminating tabular indentation, and the fact that a particular
kind of file folder costs two instead of thirty cents and can save
one hundred dollars worth of space in a safe are regarded as
statistical minutiae when presented to individual managers. In
the Agency aggregate, however, hundreds of man hours and thousands
of dollars might be saved daily by the adoption of a few
scientifically proven standards.

     e. The Agency has been getting along without the benefits
of professional records management standards for a number of
years and can ~~kxnxxn~~ continue to get along without them if Agency
management wants it that way. If that is the decision, however,
we should not retain a centralix staff with pseudo-Agency respon-
sibilities assigned to it. We should be content to allow each
of the several ~~dxxnx~~ decentralized programs to deal with them in
their own way. The Records Administration Branch should be

5

relieved of all responsibility for an Agency Program and should
become the records management unit for the Support Directorate
with authority and responsibility prescribed accordingly. This
does not seem to be a reasonable alternative, however, because
it would not only perpetuate, it would intensify the problems
we h now have with records management.

3. The problems of the Records Program in the Agency ~~would~~ will
not be overcome by decree. They can only be overcome by clear state-
ment of policy, objectives, and ~~intnt~~ intent, and the creation of a
realistic structure to make the program work. We need:

    a. The ~~xx~~ strongest possible expression of support from
the highest levels of Agency management for ~~xxxxxx~~ a totally
integrated ~~Agencyxwd~~ Agency-wide Records Management Program in-
cluding all of the elements of creation, maintenance, and dis-
position.

    b. To formalize the existing structure, which is composed
of some sixty - sixty-five people ~~around~~ in positions around the Agency charged with
records management responsibilities; to provide for the staffing
of these position with ~~proge~~ _qualified,_ professionally competent ~~people~~
personnel; and, ideally, to provide a career service mechanism
for the personnel management of these people and positions.

6

c. A formalized, ~~gr~~ regulated system governing the coordination and approval of all actions relating to any element of the Records Program.

d. An authoritative monitoring and review system reporting to the proper level of management with a regulatory requirement for response to recommendations, implementation of recommendations, and follow-up action.

e. A systematic way of exercising ~~authority~~ authoritative control over materials accepted into the Records Center for storage and the length of time that they will be held.

4. The Records Administration Branch and the Records Management Board are reasonable management instruments for the implementation of the Program. A clear statement of Agency records management policy is required together with a sharp definition of the authorities and responsibilities of each, issued in a regulatory format.

1, The problem of developing and managing personnel who are qualified in paperwork procedures, tasks, control and estimates, requires a formal program focused on that specific problem which grows more complex and important each day.

~~5~~ 2 Many ~~of~~ parts of the records management function are closely related to the information processing function of system analysis and design. Competent records management officers are systems analysts capable of dealing with the design of improved manual systems. This is, in fact, what records management officers do in the process of evaluating records systems in the offices. In principle the design of a hard copy file is as integral a part of the overall information

7

processing system as is a computer file in systems which require

automation, *the* analyst must be able to deal with *manual or automated systems* accordingly.

Manual systems have input, output, processing, and filing procedures

and the competent records management officer must be able to deal with

all of these parts of the systems. Modern records officers must also

be capable of recognizing the need and potential for automating systems

and for designing manual systems which will interface with them smoothly.

3. Conversely, systems analysts dealing with computer systems

should have an understanding of, and appreciation for, the skills of

records managers. Computer systems analysts must have an appreciation

of the technical requirements for forms design in order to take ad-

vantage of the most effective methods of preparing input and output.

They should at least be conscious of the basic principles of reports

management and records storage and maintainence since the automated

systems they develop are intended primarily to produce reports which

MUST be controlled, managed, and eventually stored in accordance with

sound records management principles.

4. The records management function is also closely related to,

but should be separated from, the archives function. The records

created, processed, maintained and stored today become the archives of

tomorrow. Careful and prudent selection of archival material is

facilitated by and dependent upon a well designed and effectively

managed records program. Early and systematic identification of record

8

material to be retained for archival preservation in a manner which

does not negate the requirement that records storage be minimized

requires that the records and archives program be compatible and care-

fully integrated even though they are separate functions.

8. Archives are the tools of the historians, who are students

and scholars. Occasionally the less ~~kanskinn~~ conscientious among the

historians may be inclined to dispose of a document after its substance

has been used and recorded in whatever historical account is being

written. This is a superficial attitude and not a prevalent one. It

is mentioned only to suggest that while there are significant areas of

interest common to the historical, archival, and records management

functions, there can also be some areas of basic conflict of interest

of the kind which can be most effectively dealt with by/all of these having

functions under a single management.

9. In the critical review I submitted ~~kax~~ late in January I said

that it is not to ~~2~~ early to ~~kax~~ begin considering the ultimate disposition

of the SIPS Task Force. The notion that DDS management ~~ux~~ must have

full responsibility for DDS systems regardless of whether they use com-

puters, desk calculators, or quill pens is just as valid now as it was

the
when we began/systems studies which have grown into the SIPS project.

We set out deliberately to develop the skills necessary to become
in the field of systems analysis.
self sufficient. We acknowledged from the outset that we would have

to rely on the Office of Computer Services for technical support in

9

the skills of kmmf computer systems design and programming in order to
get the scope of our information processing system requirements
operational in some reasonable time frame without waiting to develop
these specialized skills for ourselves. Experience in recent months
has demonstrated that system responsibility for on-going applications
is just as intense as it is for new system development. The formation
of the SIPS Task Force acknowledges that skills in computer systems
design and programming and analytical skills representing knowledge
of the subject matter and functions for which systems are being designed
and operated must be responsive to a single management structure.
Maintenance of on-going systems, the development of new ones, the adju-
dication of priorities among them, and the allocation of available
resources to meet all of these demands can only be reasonably managed
within a single management chain. This says that we should not be
looking forward to the dissolution of the SIPS Task Force, but should
be planning for its absorption into the Support Directorate.

10. Absorbing the task force into the Support Directorate
immediately raises the question about the location of the hardware.
We have said from the beginning that we see no need for the Support
Directorate to have its own hardware provided that the Office of Com-
puter Services continues to be able to furnish adequate support. Whether
computer systems designers and programmers have to be under the same
management structure as the hardware is a debatable issue, but there is
a great deal of argument to support the premise that they do not.

10

Computer service bureaus operate all over the country where centrally
located hardware services a large number and wide variety of computer
                      government
applications.   Many/organizations have hardware facilities to serve
customers in other organizations.   We have used some of these ꞈꞈꞈꞈꞈꞈ
ourselves for back-up from time to time and of course, parts of our
payroll application has been run on hardware at the Treasury Department
for several years.   It doesn't seem too unreasonable to suggest that
the Operations Division could function as a service bureau in the same
way.   In a sense it operates that way now.   Systems designers and pro-
grammers in the Management Support Division, now a part of the SIPS
Task Force, and other divisions of OCS are required to submit requests
for service almost as though they were part of another organization
                      weight
entirely.   In any event the ꞈꞈꞈꞈ of the arguments supports much more
conclusively that the analysts, designers and programmers should be
responsive to the manager who has the problem to be solved and then .
that they should respond to the manager who controls the hardware.
While probably it is not prudent to pursue this now I believe our plan-
ning for the future should anticipate that it will occur ꞈꞈThe question
of whether or not the Support Directorate should have its own hardware,
however, need not be addressed now.   If our applications, when imple-
mented, require some stand-alone configuration of computing equipment
it may make sense to have the whole thing in the DDS structure.   Whether
this occurs or not, I don't see that it needs to affect our planning
now.

11

11. The reason for mentioning the information processing organization in this paper is not only to identify the relationships and similarities with records management but to lead up to the suggestion that you may want eventually to consider the establishment of an Assistant xaptx Deputy Director for Support for Information Processingx who would have responsibility for the Support Directorate information processing activities, records management activities, archives, and Agency history. If that is a reasonable suggestion, actions you take now should be consistent with that objective.

12. The long term objective of such an organizational structure would be to provide single management direction to the interrelated functions dealing with manual and automated information processing systems; creation, maintenance, and disposition of their products; and the identification and preservation of those products which have historical and archival value. It should be at a level of the organization which permits it to function across organizational lines and deal adequately with systems which have an Agency-wide impact, to adjudicate priorities, xn and allocate resources accordingly.

13. Acknowledging that the creation of such a position and component is not a practical step to be taken now the question becomes one of selecting actions which will not be inconsistent with accomplishing that objective later if you choose to go in that direction, and which may be practical now. In an earlier paper the point has been made that

SECRET

archives should *separate from* ~~not be a part of~~ the Records Program although the archives function is closely related to the records management function. The archives function is also closely related to the historical function. Each of these units should be brought together under a single management. If this can be accomplished now, it should be but if it isn't practical for any reason I would suggest that the archives be established as a function separate from the Records Center and responsibility for it to be assigned to the Historical Staff. The main reason for suggesting this as a first step is to reinforce the notion that archives are xxpxx separate from records. Preferably, the archives function would not be subordinated to the H historical function. There could be an archives division and an historical division under a single manager.

14. Another option might be to have a records division, an archives division and a historical division under the single management of a "Director of Documentation". If this combination of functions can be accomplished in one action, it would be desirable to do so. If it is not reasonable to accomplish this in a single action, the archives and historical functions should be combined first with the records function added later.

15. A third option would be to separate the archives from the records function as x separate divisions under the same management. The principle disadvantage of this arrangement as a first step is that

13