



National Archives and Records Administration
Records Management Service Component Program (RMSC)

RMSC Requirements Development Project
Session Report – Session 8

November 16, 2005





National Archives and Records Administration
Records Management Service Component Program (RMSC)

RMSC Requirements Development Project
Session Report – Session 8 – November 16, 2005

Archivist of the United States:
The Honorable Allen Weinstein

Sponsors:

Lewis J. Bellardo, Deputy Archivist of the United States
Michael J. Kurtz, Assistant Archivist for Records Services
Thomas Mills, Assistant Archivist for Regional Services
L. Reynolds Cahoon, Assistant Archivist for Human Resources and Information Services

RMSC Program Office:

Daryll R. Prescott
Program Director
8601 Adelphi Road
College Park, MD 20740
RMSC@nara.gov
301.837.0974

Kenneth Hawkins, Ph.D.
Project Manager
8601 Adelphi Road
College Park, MD 20740
RMSC@nara.gov
301.837.1798



Executive Summary

The Records Management Service Components (RMSC) Program Requirements Development Project continued on November 16, 2005, with the eighth scheduled collaborative session with records management and enterprise information architecture stakeholders representing 14 agencies across the Federal government. The agency participants were named by their Chief Information Officers and E-Government program managers as qualified to speak for their agencies on session objectives. The RMSC Requirements Development Project additionally supports the National Archives and Records Administration, E-Government Electronic Records Management (ERM) initiative #24.

The published objectives of the RMSC Requirements Development Session 8, were to:

1. Review and validate the relevant records management statutes that apply to each records management use case
2. Review and validate changes to the use cases and functional requirements at the May 2005, sessions and documented in the July 20, 2005, Technical Report
3. Review and provide recommended actions on the Request for Information responses

All objectives were met.

A follow-on session will be conducted in December 2005 to further refine the records management use cases and their associated functional requirements.



Table of Contents

RMSC Requirements Development Project Session Overview	1
Appendix A – Session Eight Participants	A-1
Appendix B – Session Agenda	B-1
Appendix C – Renaming ‘Archival Bond’ Vote.....	C-1
Appendix D - Federal Agencies – Disposition of RFI Comments	D-1
Appendix E – Session Evaluation.....	E-1
Appendix F – Previous Reports	F-1
Appendix G – Acronyms	G-1



RMSC Requirements Development Project Session Overview

The Records Management Service Components (RMSC) Program Requirements Development Project continued on November 16, 2005, at the Dynamics Research Corporation (DRC) Decision Support Center (DSC) with the eighth of the scheduled collaborative sessions with records management and enterprise information architecture stakeholders across the Federal government.

These participants were named by their Chief Information Officers and E-Government program managers as experts authorized to speak for their agencies on session objectives. Participants met with the goal to review the recommendations, from previous sessions, made by NARA subject matter experts and representatives from industry and academia.

The published objectives of this RMSC Requirements Development Session were to:

1. Review and validate the relevant records management statutes that apply to each records management use case
2. Review and validate changes to the use cases and functional requirements at the May 2005, sessions and documented in the July 20, 2005, Technical Report
3. Review and provide recommended actions on the Request for Information responses

All objectives were met.

Attending the session was the National Archives and Records Administration and other Federal agencies, including:

- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Commerce
- Department of Defense
- Department of Treasury
- Department of Labor
- Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Department of Justice
- Department of State
- Department of Transportation
- Environmental Protection Agency
- General Services Administration
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- Social Security Administration
- Veteran's Affairs

Prior to the first major activity of the session, the RMSC Program Management Office (PMO) provided a detailed background briefing to include the purpose and outcomes of the seven previous RMSC sessions culminating in the publishing of the July 20, 2005, Technical Report.

RMSC Session 8 Objective 1: Review and validate the relevant records management statutes that apply to each records management use case

The first exercise was for the participants to review and validate the applicable records management statutes that applied to the RMSC use cases. The Federal agency participants did not wish to engage in as detailed a review of the statutes and regulations that support the RMSC functions as the PMO prepared because they firmly feel that the domain expertise they brought to the task earlier this year provided a more than adequate grounding of the product in law and regulation. After reviewing the primary statutes, the Federal agency representatives directed the PMO to further research the records management statutes and apply them to the applicable RMSC use cases.

RMSC Session 8 Objective 2: Review and validate changes to the use cases and functional requirements at the May 2005 sessions and documented in the July 20, 2005, Technical Report

The second exercise was to review for completeness and clarity each RMSC use case and its associated functional requirements as published in the RMSC July 20, 2005 report. At the conclusion of the exercise agency participants accepted the functional requirements, attributes, and use case as the basis for continued activities.

The following specific issues were discussed and actions taken:

- Within each use case, the actor “Information System” and its definition were revised.
Original: Information System - An organized set of procedures and techniques designed to store, retrieve, manipulate, analyze, and display information.
Revised: Information System *and/or Architecture* - An organized set of procedures *and/or* techniques designed to store, retrieve, manipulate, analyze, and display information.
Final Outcome: This change could not be made since the overarching concept “architecture” cannot be modeled within the Unified Modeling Language as an actor in a subordinate entity “Information System” without introducing an unacceptable redundancy loop. Original definition not changed.
- The term “Archival Bond” was changed to “Record Categorization.” The primary driver for this change is the unfamiliarity of the term “archival bond” within the Federal and commercial community. It was noted by the participants that the definition provided for archival bond was fully descriptive and applicable to the record categorization activity. (See

[Appendix C](#) for the series of votes that resulted in the acceptance of the term “Record Categorization”.)

- The word “becomes” was deleted from the Disposition Suspend Use Case purpose statement.

Original: The Disposition Suspend Use Case prevents the execution of a Disposition Instruction. This component is operating in a business context where a Suspend Disposition Authority has been issued making any record affected by it *becomes* a Suspended Record.

Revised: The Disposition Suspend Use Case prevents the execution of a Disposition Instruction. This component is operating in a business context where a Suspend Disposition Authority has been issued making any record affected by it a Suspended Record.

- The definition of Scheduled Record within the glossary of the Disposition Reinstate Use Case was revised.

Initial: Scheduled Record – A record with a disposition instruction from a Disposition Authority.

Revised: Scheduled Record – A record with a Disposition Instruction (*transfer, retention, or destruction*) from an Established Disposition Authority.

RMSC Session 8 Objective 3: Review and provide recommended actions on the Request for Information responses – [See Appendix D.](#)

The final task was for the participants to review the responses from industry to the RMSC Request for Information (RFI) and provide to the PMO their recommended responses. There were 23 issues addressed by the participants. In general, the disposition of the issues was as follows:

- Six industry recommendations can be addressed by UML modeling of the use cases
- Ten industry recommendations were accepted and actions directed
- Of thirteen industry recommendations rejected,
 - Six were deemed out of scope
 - Four were deemed not applicable because they called for changing the focus from establishing baseline requirements to a level of detail that could only be determined at the agency level
 - Three were already addressed or were based on a reader’s misunderstanding of domain information

The session concluded with a discussion of the next steps in the RMSC development process and a session evaluation.



Appendix A – Session Eight Participants

Jerrann Blount

Management Analyst
Department of Veterans Affairs
IT Records Management Service (005E3)
810 Vermont Avenue, NW
(202) 565-8936
Jerrann.Blount@mail.va.gov

Henry Breton

Records Management Infrastructure Requirements Analyst
SSA/Office of Systems
6401 Security Blvd, Woodlawn, MD 21235
410-965-5127
Henry.J.Breton@ssa.gov

Pamela Corsini

Chief Enterprise Architect
Bureau of Engraving & Printing/U.S. Department of the Treasury
14th & C Streets, SW; Washington, DC 20228
(202) 874-2054
pam.corsini@bep.treas.gov

Constance Downs

Acting Agency Records Officer
US Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (MC 2822T)
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-1640
downs.constance@epa.gov

Marlene J. Howze

DOL EA Program Manager
Office of the Chief Information Officer
FBP - Room N1301, J-8
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, D. C. 20210



John C. Krysa

Division Chief
DoD/WHS Directives, Records & Declassification
1777 N. Kent St
Arlington VA 22209
703 696-2093
john.krysa@whs.mil

Regina Martin

SSA Records Officer
Social Security Admin.
6401 Security Blvd
Baltimore, MD 21235
410-965-5555
regina.martin@ssa.gov

Debbie O'Clair

Acting Section Chief
FBI/DOJ
935 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20535
202-323-4001
doclair@ic.fbi.gov

Harriet Riofrio

DoD Records Mgmt Policy
DoD DCIO IM
Suite 600
1851 S Bell St
Arlington, VA 22204
Harriet.riofrio@osd.mil
703 602 0816

Alice Ritchie

Chief, Programs and Policies Division
State
515 22nd Street
Wash, DC 20524
202 261-8511
ritchieras@state.gov



Daniel J. Rooney

Records Management Officer
Department of Commerce
1401 Constitution Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20230
202-482-0517
drooney@doc.gov

Kara Spooner

Departmental Records Management Officer
Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20590
202-366-1965
kara.spooner@dot.gov

Colleen Snyder

Departmental Records Officer
USDA
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Room 402-W
Washington, DC 20205
202-720-8020
colleen.snyder@usda.gov

Patti Stockman

Records Officer
Office of the CIO
NASA
300 E Street SW
Washington, DC 20546
202-358-4787
patti.f.stockman@nasa.gov



Eric Stout

E-Government Specialist, HUD Privacy Advocate, and HSPD-12 Team
HUD - Office of the CIO
490 L'Enfant Plaza, SW, Washington, DC 20024
202-708-0614 ext. 6261
Eric_M._Stout@hud.gov

Marc A. Wolfe

Records Officer
Office of the Chief Information Officer
General Services Administration
18th and F Street NW
Washington DC 20405
202-501-2514
marc.wolfe@gsa.gov



Appendix B – Session Agenda

Wednesday, November 16, 2005

- 8:00 AM Arrival – Continental Breakfast
- 8:15 Welcome
- 8:30 AM Introduction
- Administrative
 - Agenda
 - Participant sign-in/introductions
 - Ground Rules
 - Expectations
- 9:00 Introductory Briefing
- Background
 - Objectives
 - Review RFI Process
- 10:00 Review & Discussion of Functional Requirements for Records Management Components in the Use Case Format
- 11:00 Review the Proposed Statutes That Apply to the Use Cases
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 PM Review and Discuss RFI Comments
- 3:00 Next Steps
- 3:45 Session Wrap up
- 4:00 Session Adjourns

Appendix C – Renaming ‘Archival Bond’ Vote

[\[Return page 3\]](#)

After a lengthy discussion, the participants concluded that the term ‘archival bond’ contained within the use cases was not the appropriate term for the activity it was intended to describe. Initially, the group brainstormed 16 possible alternatives. And then, in a series of votes, they achieved group consensus on the term ‘record categorization’. The following are the votes that resulted in the selection of this phrase.

Vote # 1

Rank Sum

195	1. Record Relationships
193	2. Record Category
192	3. Record Grouping
181	4. record associations
151	5. Archival Bond
134	6. Series
123	7. Business category
121	8. groupings by business function
120	9. records sequence
92	10. Record Linking Use Case
92	11. affiliate groupings
91	12. aggregations
65	13. classify
56	14. file
56	15. continuum
42	16. Schema



Number of Votes in Each Rating

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Mean	STD	n
1. Record Relationships	2	6	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.07	2.02	14
2. Record Category	3	3	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.21	1.81	14
3. Record Grouping	2	2	5	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.29	1.68	14
4. record associations	3	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.07	2.79	14
5. Archival Bond	3	0	0	2	2	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	6.21	4.54	14
6. Series	0	1	0	2	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	7.43	3.67	14
7. Business category	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	8.21	2.19	14
8. groupings by business function	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	8.36	1.86	14
9. records sequence	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	2	0	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	8.43	3.44	14
10. Record	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	3	0	1	2	1	1	1	10.43	3.61	14



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Mean	STD	n
Linking Use Case																			
11. affiliate groupings	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	10.43	3.78	14
12. aggregations	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	5	1	1	0	0	10.50	3.18	14
13. classify	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	2	1	12.36	3.37	14
14. file	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	2	1	13.00	1.62	14
15. continuum	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	6	13.00	3.57	14
16. Schema	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	5	4	14.00	2.48	14

Vote # 2

Rank Sum

48	1. Record Relationships
43	2. Record Category
42	3. record associations
40	4. Record Grouping
37	5. Archival Bond

Number of Votes in Each Rating

	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	STD	n
1. Record Relationships	2	6	4	0	2	2.57	1.22	14
2. Record Category	4	2	1	5	2	2.93	1.54	14
3. record associations	4	2	1	4	3	3.00	1.62	14
4. Record Grouping	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1.17	14
5. Archival Bond	3	1	3	2	5	3.36	1.60	14
Group consensus (1.00 = most consensus): 0.03								

Vote # 3

Rank Sum

22	1. Record Category
20	2. Record Relationships

Number of Votes in Each Rating

	1	2	Mean	STD	n



	1	2	Mean	STD	n
1. Record Category	8	6	1.43	0.51	14
2. Record Relationships	6	8	1.57	0.51	14
Group consensus (1.00 = most consensus): 0.02					

Appendix D - Federal Agencies – Disposition of RFI Comments

[\[Return Page 3\]](#)

1.

Industry Comment: Within the use cases, consider making the Functional Requirements and Main Flows less duplicative of one another.

Discussion Notes: Noted that while use case format does not always include the functional requirements they are included here to provide the maximum amount of useful information and to make the use case stand independently. The main flow must follow the requirements closely because the requirements identify the main activities addressed by the RM service.

Disposition: Rejected. Keep Functional Reqs and Main Flow as presented.

2.

Industry Comment: Should more effort be given to explaining the relationship, if any, between the Use Cases? carryover of preconditions implies that there is a relationship...

Discussion Notes: The pre-condition of any given use case can call an output of another service but does not require it in all cases. The evaluation of the RM Services through Unified Modeling Language will make the interrelationships more clear.

Disposition: Accepted. Directs RMSC program to insert paragraph on service relationships in the session report and to document the RMSCs in Unified Modeling Language.

3.

Industry Comment: The flow sections of the use case are identical in many cases, while the business context is different: should the UC be merged into one with different flows for each business context?

Discussion Notes: Actually the flow sections are specific to each use case, each of which reflects a common records management activity. Merging them all together would defeat the main objective of identifying core records management activities that can be supported with software services within the FEA and make the differentiation of them less clear.

Disposition: Rejected. Keep the functional requirements and flows unique to each Records Management activity.

4.

Industry Comment: Difficulty distinguishing between “first” and “update” use cases: “Integrating triggers or conditions that cause one use case to end and be a precondition on the next may distinguish the actual relationship more clearly.”

Discussion Notes: Discussion about removing separate Use Case (provenance, category, disposition) and make First and Subsequent into Alternate Flows, however participants concluded that the activities were discrete enough to justify leaving them as separate use cases.

Disposition: Rejected.

5.

Industry Comment: In all the use cases, the actor names are the same and are very generic. Should they vary by use case?

Discussion Notes: The specific actor would be identified at the agency level implementation Use Case but not at this level of abstraction. The present report’s level of abstraction at service level description is appropriately different from agency level (business activity dependent) in which agency-specific roles might be distinguished.

Disposition: Rejected.

6.

Industry Comment: Should each step in the main flow be correlated to a unique actor?

Discussion Notes: In addition to discussion of comment 5, above, stipulating an actor for each step in the main flow would be presuming steps toward a solution; out of place for documentation of functional requirements at this level of abstraction.

Disposition: Rejected.

7.

Industry Comment: Should the use case report adopt the “Industry Best Practice is to supplement functional requirements with diagrams that provide a visual representation of the desired behavior of the system.”

Discussion Notes: Participating agencies agreed that a visual diagram or model would of the RM services would enhance clarity. Participants authorized RMSC program with translating the use case into Unified Modeling Language (UML).

Disposition: Accepted.

8.

Industry Comment: Should the glossaries at the end of each use case be merged into one glossary?

Discussion Notes: Participating agencies can see the advantage of having a separate standalone glossary that incorporates all terms in the individual use case glossaries but felt that each use case should be independent and thus have its own specific glossary. Participants authorized the RMSC program with preparing a consolidated glossary for the report.

Disposition: Accepted with modification.

9.

Industry Comment: Should attributes be labeled as mandatory, optional, or default?

Discussion Notes: Currently all attributes identified in the use case are mandatory, variations from this would be identified in a data model providing attribute relationships to entities. Participants authorized RMSC program with translating the use case into Unified Modeling Language (UML).

Disposition: Accepted with modification.

10.

Industry Comment: Should any relationship between use cases be made explicit?

Discussion Notes: RM Service Use Case should not call another Use Case but require a pre-condition as they do currently. Calling another use case presumes an implementation design is being favored. See Number 2, above.

Disposition: Rejected.

11.

Industry Comment: Should the definition of Scheduled Record be filled out with more detail?

Discussion Notes: Agency participants revised the definition of Scheduled Record as follows: Scheduled Record - A record with a Disposition Instruction (*transfer, retention, or destruction*) from an Established Disposition Authority.

Disposition: Accepted.

12.

Industry Comment: Disposition Enable Transfer Use Case and Disposition Enable Destruction Use Case: should the terms “transfer” and “destruction” be defined?

Discussion Notes: These two services are explicitly intended to make records available for each activity; the actual methodology and technique of transfer and destruction remain undefined intentionally because these activities are out of scope of the RMSC. Defining the terms would be specifying an implementation or design.

Disposition: Rejected.

13.

Industry Comment: We recommend that you employ an activity diagram of use cases, a package diagram, or both to arrange use cases into groups of logical dependencies.

Discussion Notes: Participating agencies agreed that a visual diagram or model would of the RM services would enhance clarity. Participants authorized RMSC program with translating the use case into Unified Modeling Language (UML).

Disposition: Accepted.

14.

Industry Comment: Should the use cases be reworked as service processes rather than component-based processes?

Discussion Notes: Discussion noted that a component as defined is a design solution – a service is at a level above any solution allowing broad application and implementation (higher level of abstraction).

Disposition: Accepted.

15.

Industry Comment: Should the business context of the creation of a case file be spelled out more clearly? (Case File Record Capture and Case File Part Associate use cases)

Discussion Notes: Participating agencies agreed that the purpose statements and examples noted in the use case could be expanded in order to make the general business context and requirement for a case file more clear. They directed the RMSC program to do this.

Disposition: Accepted.

16.

Industry Comment: Should specific values for any one attribute be provided? i.e., for Disposition Establish, Disposition_Instruction_Current attribute, should we indicate what values would be available (temporary, permanent etc.?)

Discussion Notes: A UML data model could provide information about the data, definition, length, character constraints. Participating agencies directed the RMSC program to include this information or representative examples in the UML exercise.

Disposition: Accepted.

17.

Industry Comment: Should the business context or workflow of RM be strengthened so industry can see how the components would be used?

Discussion Notes: Participating agencies agreed that familiarity with RM business is expected of the reader. Workflow presupposes an implementation design and is thus out of scope in this effort, because such design varies by detailed business requirements. Participating agencies directed the RMSC program to prepared UML models to identify entity relationships.

Disposition: Rejected.

18.

Industry Comment: Integrated business rules would help and better describe who and when updates can be made.

Discussion Notes: Definition of business rules again raises the issue of what level of detail is appropriate for a characterization of baseline functional requirements. Since business rules vary by organization specifying them here would presuppose an implementation design. Participating agencies felt that the business requirements are spelled out at an appropriate level of abstraction.

Disposition: Rejected.

19.

Industry Comment: Recommend that a formal, logical data model and data dictionary now be developed (even if in draft form) to facilitate prototyping and piloting of RMSC components that can be tested and evaluated.

Discussion Notes: See comment 16, above. Participating agencies directed the RMSC program to include these elements as part of the UML modeling effort.

Disposition: Accepted.

20.

Industry Comment: recommends that NARA with the support of OMB and its agency partners embark on a prototyping and piloting initiative as soon as possible.

Discussion Notes: Since this effort is to establish baseline functional requirements these activities are out of scope.

Disposition: Rejected.

21.

Industry Comment: Should the technical context be made more concrete by invoking available technical standards, whether archival or computer science?

Discussion Notes: Participating agencies noted that during the January to March sessions they examined archival context through a comparison matrix provided by Georgia Tech Research Institute that identified RM activities as defined by six major initiatives (DoD RMTF, UBC, ISO 15489, MOREC, etc. and were satisfied that no major RM activity area was missing. Technical contexts beyond the FEA context are deemed out of scope.

Disposition: Rejected.

22.

Industry Comment: Should there be a special use for business situations in which the user may be a machine, system, or application or where the real time binding of attributes to a record is problematic?

Discussion Notes: Participating agencies noted that information system is already included among the use case actors for all use case.

Disposition: Rejected.

23.

Industry Comment: Include language in the report regarding the business case for RMSCs within the FEA?



Discussion Notes: Since the focus for this effort is developing baseline functional requirements for RM services in the context of the FEA participants agreed that references to a business case should be minimal. It was felt that the RM Profile of the FEA is the place to argue the business case.

Disposition: Rejected.

Appendix E – Session Evaluation

1. What Went Well?

- Moved along quickly. Good progress.
- Efficient use of time
- Good flow of discussion. Kept on target.
- Good use of time
- Good facilitation, allowing opinions to be expressed, but moving the session along.
- Excellent facilitating (and facilities).
- Good participation and attendance. Some good work has been done. More clarity has been provided about progress, political barriers, et al.
- Ditto to moving along at a good pace
- Organized structure and products in final form for easy review
- Great PowerPoint slides and explanation by Ken.
- More flexibility in debate and dialog than before
- Efficiently facilitated with effective explanation and reasoning provided by project managers.
- Session was well organized and moved well. decision making process was easier than previous sessions
- This went along according to schedule. The explanation of the RMSC was excellent.
- Came to consensus, with at least "80% solution" on all points -- most were closer to 100%
- We got through quite a lot of information in a relatively short amount of time. The facilities are very nice and lunch was great! Thanks!
- As usual, after the computers are on for awhile, it becomes really warm.

2. What Needs To Be Improved?

- No suggestions.
- Manage discussion of comments that go on for a long period of time.
- Taking control of long discussions
- Need to stress the continuity of agency participants to the greatest extent possible.
- A bit frustrating to discover archivist-centric terms and labels imposed after the last interagency consensus document that did not communicate to users, records managers, CIO's or executives

- Need better support of ideas--leaders assume they are right and often try to cut off important discussion...this improved over the length of the session. Need more interest in and respect for dissenting opinions as those were quite fruitful today
- Needs more enforcement.
- Pre-meeting catch up of new participants as to scope and objectives of the session and overall RMSC project
- All program participants need to do "read ahead" of provided materials prior to scheduled sessions.

3. Other Comments

- Enjoyed the experience. I now have a better understanding of what the initiative is.
- The session was very informative. However, it would have been more productive if process flows had been developed for a more in-depth understanding of each Service Area.
- Temperature in the room should be a little cooler
- Thank you all for another great session!
- Extremely informative and thought provoking per usual.
- Very informative - a great session.
- Thanks for the effort! a good product is emerging...
- Great presenters! I learned a lot and look forward to the next meeting.
- I will keep my agency inform of what RMSC is going to accomplish.
- Great flexibility and openness by NARA reps and consultants. Didn't feel like this was a way to validate NARA opinions. Felt you really wanted my opinion.



Appendix F – Previous Reports

- 1) RMSC Requirements Development Project Workshop Report, Session 1 – January 11–13, 2005
- 2) RMSC Requirements Development Project Workshop Report, Session 2 – January 25–27, 2005
- 3) RMSC Requirements Development Project Workshop Report, Session 3 – February 9–10, 2005
- 4) RMSC Requirements Development Project Workshop Report, Session 4 – February 28, March 1, 2005
- 5) RMSC Requirements Development Project Workshop Report, Session 5 – March 3, 2005
- 6) RMSC Requirements Development Project Workshop Report, Session 6 – March 9, 2005
- 6) RMSC Requirements Development Project Final Report – March 31, 2005
- 7) RMSC Use Cases Session Report, Session 7 – May 2–3, 9–10, 2005
- 8) Prescott, Hawkins, “Functional Requirements and Attributes for Records Management in a Components–Based Architecture,” NARA RMSC Program Office Technical Report – July 20, 2005



Appendix G – Acronyms

DRC	Dynamics Research Corporation
DSC	Decision Support Center
ERM	Electronic Records Management
NARA	National Archives and Records Administration
PMO	Program Management Office
RM	Records Management
RMSC	Records Management Service Components