

Advisory Committee on the Electronic Records Archives  
Meeting No. 12  
National Archives Building  
Draft Minutes  
April 6, 2011

Welcome Remarks – David S. Ferriero, Archivist of the United States

Mr. Ferriero opened the meeting at 8:38 a.m. and introduced the new member, Charley Barth, Director of Records for the Department of the Navy, and the new Chief Information Officer, Mike Walsh. Committee members present: Dr. Robert Martin, Chair, Charley Barth, Laura E. Campbell, David Carmicheal, Sharon Dawes, Dennis Day, Dr. Richard Fennell, Dr. Christopher Greer, Jerry Handfield, Dr. Robert E. Kahn, Andy Maltz, John Phillips, Daniel Pitti, Jonathan Redgrave, David Rencher, Dr. Kelly Woestman.

Mr. Ferriero reviewed developments since the last meeting:

- The GAO report about cost overruns on the project. The report is based on a development schedule that goes to 2017, but development is finishing in 2011, so the projected costs of over a billion are actually \$570 million.
- Development of a plan in the event of a government shutdown. There are essential services that will continue working through any shutdown.

Comments from the Chair – Dr. Robert Martin

This meeting was planned as a longer, denser workday rather than a two-day meeting. He asked the members to introduce themselves. He reviewed the action items. The single action item received was the creation of the subcommittees and the establishment of communication mechanisms for the subcommittees. Progress had been made and the members were provided documentation.

Adoption of the Minutes (November 3-4, 2010)

Mr. Ferriero moved approval of the minutes of the November 3-4, 2010 Committee meeting. Dr. Woestman seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.

ERA Status Update – Meg Phillips and Chuck Piercy

Ms. Phillips introduced the update. The team developed a presentation as part of the ongoing attempt get funding under the continuing resolution rules. The presentation has been given to House and Senate Appropriations Committee Staffers. It acknowledges problems in the management of the program and expresses appreciation for the advice from GAO and OMB. The program has been completely restructured and management is being improved. The presentation is divided into a few sections:

- FY2011 accomplishments to date;

- What's been done with the continuing resolution money that has been released and the multi-year funding left over from FY2010;
- Major development milestones through FY2011;
- Problems and corrective actions—GAO and OMB recommendations and what the program has done in response.
- What ERA will look like when development is completed;
  - ERA had to reprioritize the original requirements.
- The Federal Agency Rollout Project Process;
  - The schedule for adding federal agencies and how many terabytes of records have been brought into the system
- How much money the project has and how much it expects to receive;
  - Because the project is in development, it was sometimes difficult to identify a deliverable within the 30 day funding cycle
- Future milestones of functionality;
  - The milestones will be met within FY2011. In FY2012, there may be a change in operations and maintenance contractors, so the amount of engineering and architecture work done in-house may change.

The prioritization process determined what unmet requirements need to be met in FY2011, looking at what stakeholder group each requirement, what can be completed within a year, and to protect the work from a possible government shutdown. By the end of FY2011, ERA will be able to:

- Provide online public access to and information about the electronic records;
- Provide public use copies of presidential records in order to respond to FOIA requests when the records are opened in 2014;
- Serve the records management needs of federal agencies;
- Provide automated support for basic records management transactions with the National Archives;
- Provide unclassified storage for federal records, presidential records, and Congressional records;
- Provide classified record storage for federal records and secure storage for Census records;
- Utilize the first format migration tool.

This prioritized schedule captures most of the goals of from the beginning of the project.

Mr. Piercy said the first Base Increment 3 authorization to operate in February was a major milestone, implementing service-oriented architecture. The rest of the work consists of five pieces:

- Base enhancements, which are a series of software releases;
- A series of EOP releases for the Executive Office of the President;
- A series releases associated with online public access (OPA)
- A classified instance of CERA used in the base software release;
- Census work to meet Title 13 requirements.

A total of 180 requirements are being implemented in the final year of development.

FOIA support for the EOP is critical for the release of the Bush 43 presidential records. Another key milestone was authorization to operate the OPA capability in December. There is \$10 million of carryover from FY2010 that will be used to fund the O&M contract beginning at the end of the fiscal year. NARA should not have submitted the FY2011 expenditure plan directly to Congress without OMB review. It was submitted to OMB in December and their comments were incorporated into the plan and submitted to Congress. GAO recommended continuing to review and prioritize the requirements throughout the program's life cycle, and that recommendation has been incorporated.

The GAO audit was addressed by taking the specific GAO recommendations and showing the specific actions NARA has taken to address them. NARA undertook a program restructuring as a result of TechStat activities that included:

- Assigning all communications responsibilities to a single NARA employee, David Lake;
- Planning specific start dates for all cabinet-level agencies to begin using ERA;
- Updating training and actively guiding agencies through startup;
- Assigning agency contacts and reaching out to agencies for better coordination;
- Providing better executive-level oversight;
- Implementing an automated tool to help track and analyze requirements traceability;
- Upgrading the project management tool, PROMPT, and developing a corrective action plan that addresses all GAO recommendations on earned value management;
- Adopting a spiral software development approach with more frequent produce focus and smaller releases;
- Doing a better job of cost estimation prior to making the model for the development and maintenance contracts a firm, fixed price with competitive bidding.

Committee Comments for Ms. Phillips:

Mr. Phillips commented that there are work-arounds for some of the goals that have been removed, expressed concern that some of the tools will be lost, and wondered if some of the tools can be partially funded by other agencies or vested interests. Ms. Phillips said the migration tools will never be complete, since there are always new formats, but she hopes to work with other agencies.

Dr. Kahn wondered how long it will take to ingest the past 40 years of electronic records. Ms. Phillips said the hope was for ERA to be the repository of the whole collection, which will take another year, which the Committee saw as impressive progress. The Mass Ingest function has been dropped because it is no longer necessary. Dr. Kahn asked about paper records that are already scanned. Ms. Phillips said documents that have been scanned can be put in ERA, but the issue is collecting relevant metadata for cataloging and indexing. Dr. Kahn said the most important thing is to know how to migrate and evolve the system over time. Mr. Pitti urged that someone assess the risk of emphasizing

a short term strategy of addressing problems--ingest and dissemination of materials leaving out the core archival management system.

Committee Comments for Mr. Piercy:

Mr. Phillips emphasized the need, when presenting on the project, to have a stakeholder's model showing how the needs of various audiences, especially the average person, are being met.

Dr. Greer asked about the strategy to address GAO's review of information security, since additional capacity will create new channels for vulnerability. Mr. Piercy said the ERA program is diligent about information security; records are approved for access before being included in the OPA. The Committee recessed from 10:07 to 10:21 a.m.

#### Roll Out of ERA to Federal Agencies - Paul Wester

Mr. Wester, Chief Records Officer, said there has been a series of rollout activities with pilot agencies since 2007 working with NARA and giving feedback on the system. The plan is to have the system in place by 2012. Since November, when there was a conversation about constructing user adaptation and agency adoption of ERA, there has been a series of communication activities, such as the Federal Records Council, the Chief Information Officers Council, and the Bimonthly Records and Information Discussion Group.

There are two goals for the rollout: to help the agencies perform records management functions and to get current records into the Archives that can be made available through ERA. Three pathfinder agencies were used to kick off agency adoption: HHS, the Department of State, and DOJ. The team met with these agencies and developed ways of transferring records. The team has met with 12 other agencies and has plans in place to meet with more. There are a number of sub-bureaus the team is working with to implement ERA use by July of 2011. NARA provides training, identifies the body of records, and works to get them using the system. By the end of December, NARA use should be mandatory.

The current goal is to ingest 10 terabytes per quarter. That goal was reached in the first quarter (10.1 TB) and the second quarter (10.9). Some of the materials ingested were Federal EOP (5 TB), House of Representatives videos (3 TB), and NASA videos (2 TB). With ingestion, there is a great deal of processing. Ms. Phillips pointed out that because the Census records are so consistent, they can be handled at a mass description level. Since Archives has been scheduling electronic records from agencies all along, using ERA to transfer the files does not greatly increase the workload to the point of overwhelming staff.

Mr. Wester said agencies also have legacy caches of electronic records agencies want to transfer. Ms. Phillips said they will uncover the caches in meetings with the agencies and,

once the caches are dealt with, develop the relationship so Archives will know what records are being created on an ongoing basis.

Committee Comments for Mr. Wester:

Dr. Woestman asked that the Committee be informed on the internal briefings and teaching methods so they can help. Dr. Kahn asked where the push for the agencies to participate is coming from. Mr. Wester said there is support from OMB and the executive secretariat. Dr. Kahn emphasized the need for agreement on an extendable meta-level interface for all the agencies that can be adapted over time and for the records to be understandable in the distant future. Dr. Greer said the push from OMB for agencies to reduce the cost of records management will be a motivator; regularizing across the agencies will reduce costs.

#### ERA Funding Status - Chuck Piercy

The total appropriated funding to the ERA program from FY2002 through FY2011 (based on an estimate of \$72 million for FY2011) is \$463.06 million.

- Program management, \$149.99 million;
- Development, 268.38 million;
- Operation and maintenance, \$44.69 million.

The system has been operational since 2008 and will be fully operational by the end of FY2011. GAO's estimate of \$762 million to \$1.4 billion goes out to 2020 so the numbers are considerably different. Completion of the development phase will be contingent on getting funding on time. Of the \$72 million, about \$20 million has been authorized.

#### NARA Analysis of Legal Environment for Federal Records Management – Charley Barth

Mr. Barth spoke on the Navy experience with ERA. He recommended that the members access ERA and experience the interface. Currently, the system is not intuitive. He suggested using a wizard-based interface rather than screens with numerous fields to fill out. The help desk is not helpful for general questions. Agencies need full functionality to control access and provide accounts rather than always going through NARA. The transfer request process is confusing and more difficult than the old paper-based system. There should be status notifications in the schedule submission process to provide greater visibility. He recommended that NARA stop accepting paper SF-115s and 258s after November 11 in order to force use of ERA.

In the Department of the Navy, there are 500 record series that will go to Archives. At some point, ERA will have to address the massive backlog in the agencies and agencies' records management problems.

Ms. Dawes asked about the skill level of the people using ERA. Mr. Barth there is no particular skill set that identifies a typical user, but it is clearly not for everybody. Mr. Phillips commented that electronic records systems fail when they ask for too much metadata. Use of records management liaisons and embedding trained people into the

infrastructure can take some weight off the end users. Without that, there is a danger of pushback or drops in participation. In the private sector, metadata is captured using automated tools. Mr. Pitti noted that many of the fields can be self-populating. Mr. Handfield warned that some vendors will want to charge for the cost of exporting to ERA. Mr. Barth said integration with agency records management applications (RMAs) and open architecture for system-to-system communication would help participation. There has not been adequate feedback from NARA on the comments he has submitted.

#### NARA Analysis of Legal Environment for Federal Records Management - Mark Giguere

Mr. Giguere, Lead IT Specialist for Policy and Planning, presented on the Federal Records Act Integrated Product Team (FRA IPT), which he led in response to TechStat item 6: to initiate a review of regulations and statutes towards improving the efficiency of government-wide ERM with the hope of making ERA easier to use, making sure they promote the transfer of permanent materials to the ERA, and providing for eventual mandatory use of ERA. The task was started in August 2010 and transmitted to OMB in December 2010. The process was to convene a workgroup, open a wiki for revision suggestions and ranking, analyze the comments, de-brief NRMCM and N/ND on the comments, and create a report, which was commented on and cleared by N/ND before submission to OMB.

Two high-level decisions were made by the Archivist and Deputy Archivist:

- Regulatory changes would not be included in the evaluation until OMB reacted to statutory revision proposals;
- No statutory changes were needed to enable TechStat Objective 3.

Five proposed changes were sent to OMB:

- Modernize the definition of a record by generalizing the definition of a record from an enumeration to “recorded information;” in Title 44§3301;
- Provide AOTUS with clear authority to define records in title 44§3301(b) and make it binding on all agencies;
- Provide AOTUS with clear authority to require digital preservation of e-records in Title 44§2904 and 2901 using amended versions of the language from HR 5811 and HR 1387;
- Eliminate the 30-year presumption on transfer of permanent records and provide an enforcement mechanism for NARA’s pre-accessioning policy by eliminating the language “in existence for more than 30 years” from Title 44§2107 and allowing AOTUS to enforce pre-accessioning on a case-by-case basis;
- Clarify the Archivist’s sole authority in the area of records management by eliminating multiple references to the Administration of GSA in Title 44§2904.

The draft report was transmitted to OMB in December and is still under review.

Committee Comments for Mr. Giguere:

Mr. Handfield asked if there is any place in the proposals or regulations that gives the Archivist authority to require interaction with records management on the purchase of

record-keeping systems. Mr. Giguere said that is not explicitly stated, but the Archivist does have the authority to establish minimum mandatory functional requirements for electronic records management systems and to certify that the agencies' electronic records management systems meet functional requirements.

#### Online Public Access Update - Pamela Wright

Ms. Wright, Chief Digital Access Strategist, said Online Public Access (OPA) is a prototype of public search and display capabilities for online access to holdings and information about holdings. It is part of the flagship initiative in the Open Government Plan and a user-centric approach to fulfilling NARA's Strategic Goal 4, to provide prompt, easy, and secure access to holdings anywhere, anytime. It was launched in December of 2010 and has had 51,802 visits with the average visit at six and a half minutes. Users are encouraged to submit feedback, and about 200 comments have been received, many from non-archivists, such as genealogists and educators. There has been discussion of OPA on social media sites and high-profile blogs and NARA is building relationships with the public. NARA has created an OPA search box widget that can be embedded on people's pages. There are four OPA software releases planned for 2011.

- OPA 5.1.1 in April will introduce
  - Image Zoom,
  - Add This Widget to share results via social networking sites,
  - Reports (e.g. Top 20 Search Terms).
- OPA 5.2.1 in June will introduce
  - User registration and tagging,
  - Search tuning.
- OPA 5.3.1 in July will introduce
  - A download page for unrestricted electronic records
  - Search with parent.
- OPA 5.4.1 in September will introduce
  - My List, which enables registered users to save searches,
  - Presidential Library Webpage results and grouping.

Features to add in the future include:

- Application Programming Interface (API),
- The ability to email brief and full results, with or without digital attachments,
- Tagging of digital objects attached to descriptions,
- Ask an Archivist chat,
- OPA on the Go Mobile App,
- Integration with NARA's description and authority services to receive new and updated archival descriptions and authorities,
- Improvements to display and navigation,
- Index browsing for organizations and people,
- Pocket Archivist, a free app that will allow a researcher to photograph a document, add metadata, and upload it for inclusion in OPA.

Committee Comments for Ms. Wright:

Mr. Rencher suggested allowing other developers to develop APIs using the data. Mr. Maltz asked for the current thinking on companies making money off the OPA data. Ms. Wright hoped that the public and business communities make good use of the data. Dr. Kahn said the API should be at a higher level than the content so a number of different apps can be run on the API. He recommended that Pocket Archivist be available on all three mobile platforms and added that Archives can develop apps not intended for general distribution but for use by government agencies.

Mr. Carmicheal said it will be useful at some point to talk about how NARA intends to deal with proprietary vendor-created software.

### ERA Technology and Development Strategy - Meg Phillips and Quyen Nguyen

Ms. Phillips' presentation focused on the architecture rather than implementation level. The project will continue to refine adherence to the architectural concept. The high-level requirements for the long-term archive emphasize

- Extensibility to add new types of records, data, and services without extensive redesign;
- Evolvability so new technologies can be inserted using standards, APIs, and interfaces;
- Availability of key functions;
- Scalability to adapt to record volume and user community growth;
- Security for protection of the system and its assets;
- User-friendliness--using a browser interface, being intuitive, and being 508 compliant.

Mr. Nguyen spoke on the design approach, which started with Increment one (I1) in 2008.

- Develop ERA Reference Architecture
  - Correct deficiencies such as a lack of evolvability, extensibility, and scalability in I1;
  - Create a reference architecture tool to guide current and future design and development starting with I3.
- The goal of the architecture is to build a robust platform
  - To develop, add, and enhance services and applications;
  - That responds to deficiencies found in I1 architecture;
  - That is adaptive to changes, especially business rules;
  - That is the foundation for the preservation framework and the access framework.
- The platform should have a standard interface by utilizing
  - Open standards from the backend layer to the presentation layer;
  - Domain standards such as Open Architecture Information System (OAIS) and PREservation Metadata Implementation Strategies (PREMIS).
- The approach should be data-minded and security-minded.

The reference architecture facilitates system evolution to new technologies such as cloud computing, Web 2.0, social media, and future technologies, and helps leverage community support. The reference architecture should have well-defined system interfaces, a well-defined data and metadata model. Once the reference architecture is developed it should be published. White papers on the architecture and the data model have been written.

Evolvable system architecture relies on three pillars:

- The Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) paradigm (how to process),
- The metadata model (what to process),
- The content server (where to store processed data).

The architecture is based on the OASIS reference model.

The SOA paradigm is based in two components: services and the Enterprise Service Bus (ESB), which is middleware that allows the services to exchange messages. Starting from the OASIS model, business services are designed for ingestion, preservation, and access. To support these services, lower level services are designed: tool services, such as virus scanning and file format identification, and Common services, such as logging and authorization. The low-level services are composed into business services using ESB. The SOA paradigm adds flexibility and extensibility because services can be added or replaced. Integration of tool services is key to evolvable architecture and old tools can be replaced by new tools.

Ms. Phillips spoke on the second core pillar of evolvable system architecture, the metadata model. ACE uses an XML database, and components can be added to the metadata model by adding XML tags. Its basic structure is extensible. Data structures are in place to work over the features as records are transformed or migrated. ERA needs the capability to create and manage different versions of an electronic record and relate them to a single logical entity. That need is met by the underlying PREMIS structure, which tracks not only versions of records but also actions taken on records and by what agent.

The content server concept is the last pillar of the evolvable system architecture. The content server is a wrapper of a particular set of records storage, the metadata, and business rules specific to that type of record. Archives handles three major types of records that are governed by different laws, have different levels of security and access, and have different metadata and business rules. Additional content servers can be added to the existing interface to scale and adapt to different types of records.

Mr. Nguyen said a survey of system architecture designed for digital preservations and archives validated ERA's approach. Moving forward, the architectural components should be externalized to promote reuse among other systems within NARA. The system interfaces and data and metadata models should be published and the knowledge shared with other agencies. There should be collaboration with other archives, digital libraries, and research communities. Open source software can be used to reduce life cycle costs. The Committee recessed from 1:04 to 1:55 p.m.

## Committee Comments

Mr. Phillips confirmed that ERA owns the reference model and suggested promotion of a collaborative ownership of the model among the agencies, public, and Archives, since buy-in and participation are key. Dr. Kahn expressed concern with some of the implementation choices. Some of the more troubling choices were avoiding identifiers and the use of specific technologies, such as tying the architecture to XML metadata rather than making the architecture much higher level. Archives must have its own view of what it wants and how to manage it. Mr. Nguyen said identifiers are crucial, but they were left out of the presentation due to its simplicity and the time constraints. On evolvability, he pointed out that the SOA paradigm evolves and does not dictate any technology.

### Contractor Patent Applications - Stephani Abramson

Ms. Abramson, Counsel for Procurement and Employment Law, led a discussion on patent issues related to ERA. The contract uses a standard clause (FAR 52.227-14 Alternate IV) giving Lockheed Martin copyright on the software but giving the government an unlimited, nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to use it however it sees fit. The follow-on contractor can use it and the software can be corrected in the future. It cannot be disclosed publicly, but bidders on the O&M contract have access to the data with the use of non-disclosure agreements.

While the contract did not specifically include a patents rights clause, the *Christian* doctrine in the case law reads necessary clauses into contracts. Under the standard clause (FAR 52.227-11), the government receives a nonexclusive, nontransferable, irrevocable, paid-up license to practice the subject invention developed with government funds and the contractor keeps the patent, provided the contractor notifies the government of the invention within two months of being notified by the inventor. If there is no timely notice, the government can assert ownership of the patent.

Lockheed applied for eight patents related to the ERA contract and three have been issued. Because LMC did not notify NARA of the subject inventions until January of 2011, NARA has notified LMC of its intent to assert government ownership of the patents under FAR 52.227-11. This is due to concerns about future access and use. NARA is awaiting a response from LMC. It is possible that an agreement can be reached on future use without the matter going to court. There are discussions with DOJ in the case of litigation. NARA wants to cover all possible use of the inventions, including possibly changing them in the future.

Mr. Barth wondered how the issue can impact the follow-on contract. Ms. Abramson said it can affect parts of the contract related to corrective action. It should not affect the awarding of the contract.

Dr. Kahn asked what the patents are. Ms. Abramson said they are patents on the system design of an electronic record archive. They are very broad, which can cause problems in

the future. Dr. Kahn asked that the information be emailed to the Committee, since the patents sounded too broad to be valid. Mr. Phillips agreed that the patents probably should not have been issued, and they could impact redeployment of ERA as an open source architecture to other agencies and the states. Mr. Ferriero pointed out that the data rights clause would affect sharing the design or product with the states anyway. Dr. Kahn pointed out that the interfaces are most important. If Lockheed cannot claim the interfaces, other parties can plug other software into the architecture.

Ms. Phillips asked if there is information NARA developed or supplied to the contractor, such as the code for ERA, that Lockheed cannot control. Ms. Abramson said there is, and it would be worthwhile to look at the information and pull out pieces NARA developed. Mr. Piercy noted that one of the patent applications included diagrams from the original solicitation. Dr. Kahn said the patents can be challenged directly with the Patent Office while proceeding with the contract issue. Ms. Abramson said there have been many staff changes at Lockheed, and this could have been a mistake.

#### ACERA Discussion of Goals, Subcommittee Structure: Dr. Robert Martin

Dr. Martin said the subcommittees were supposed to have met virtually working on preliminary discussions and reports via wiki by January. Mary Ann Hadyka referred the members to a document on subcommittee rules and procedures. The chair and members lead the discussions, but the DFOs have to be part of all communications. Members of the Committee who are not members of a particular subcommittee cannot meet with the members of that subcommittee for subcommittee work. The recommendations of the subcommittees must be put forward to the full Committee. There cannot be a general subcommittee wiki, but there can be separate wikis for each subcommittee, email exchanges, and conference calls. The Committee recessed for subcommittee meetings from 2:46 to 3:42 p.m.

#### Subcommittee Reports on Work plans to ACERA

Dr. Martin reported as the acting chair of the Legal and Policy Construct Subcommittee. After discussion on FRA IPT, the subcommittee endorsed and supported the report of the FRA IPT and encouraged its adoption by Congress under HR 1144, the bill that includes the language. He moved that the full Committee adopt the recommendation and that it be communicated to OMB. Dr. Woestman seconded and the motion carried.

Future activities for the subcommittee are to produce a white paper looking at what an ideal Federal Records Act would look like in the digital environment. Second is to explore approaches to give the Archivist authority to mandate that federal information systems incorporate record-keeping and digital preservation requirements and that future procurement processes for information systems in the federal government meet record-keeping requirements established by the Archivist. Mr. Barth suggested looking at OMB Circular 8130. Mr. Carmicheal hoped the question of what constitutes a record can be addressed.

Dr. Kahn reported from the Technology Issues Subcommittee. The first recommendation was to rename the subcommittee as the Architecture Challenges Group. They decided that NARA must maintain the architecture and its evolution to minimize the cost of evolution in the face of technological changes and must leverage any investments effectively for the future. There were two main topics of discussion: avoiding technological obsolescence by operating at a higher level, independent of the technology, and getting as much as possible out of the system's performance. For future work, they thought of an architectural approach to metadata that can employ a registry separate from archiving. Another issue was what kind of data model structures make sense so there is not obsolescence at the data model level. Security has to play a role in the architecture, so there has to be ID management. Mr. Maltz will try to articulate some of the technological issues. Mr. Barth will look at the repository issue. Ms. Campbell will look at the data model choices. Mr. Day and Dr. Kahn will look at IT management issues and their relationship to security.

The second recommendation was to use existing technology to demonstrate how some of the architectural ideas can be shown to be relevant to the evolution of the ERA, treating ERA as a legacy system that will evolve and interface with some other future system. There was no motion.

Mr. Phillips spoke for the Development Strategies Subcommittee, which focused on making sure the current design meets the needs of the future archival community. The subcommittee will write some lessons learned and suggestions on a collaborative design model incorporating the agencies and public into becoming stakeholders in the design. The subcommittee will also reevaluate the technical aspects of the open system architecture and how they benefit stakeholders. They will propose pilots to react to the current designs to see whether stakeholder needs are being met. The subcommittee will write lessons learned and insights on that. The DFO will look at what commentary will be useful and milestones will be established for going forward after a wiki discussion.

For the Interface Subcommittee, Dr. Woestman said OPA has gone a long way, but the search engine has become more complicated. He wants to build on the idea of diverse users and public ownership, building apps so anyone can access the records easily. There is a need to break the siloing between Archives and the Library of Congress. There is potential with students and teachers to make the information more available. The Committee wants to underscore that it agrees with opening the door to search widgets.

Going forward, the subcommittee wants to know the lessons learned on digitizing from the Footnote partnership. The added value will come from outside. He referred to the Census records destroyed in 1950. There is an opportunity to demonstrate OPA and get feedback at the August Teaching America History program. There was no motion, but Dr. Woestman said there should be some activity at that conference. Members mentioned the Smithsonian, National Library of Medicine, and Agriculture as other silos.

Mr. Rencher spoke for the Communications Subcommittee. Their main topic of discussion was who could be advocates for ERA and looking for opportunities at

conferences or calls for papers to give an ERA presentation. NARA would have to provide a presentation of facts and what key messages to incorporate. He has given two such presentations so far and will provide his slides to the Committee. Rebecca Worlow had given instruction on how to use the presentation and how to engage the audience. He hoped to see that replicated, looking at agencies that can be more instrumental in helping. Mr. Barth said he is doing a promotional video for ERA.

Dr. Martin asked for general consensus on the subcommittees continuing to meet in this manner. There was general agreement. The subcommittees should continue to be active between meetings online and with conference calls.

Mr. Barth asked the Communications Subcommittee to think about branding and marketing issues. Dr. Martin pointed out that different segments of the population will require differently-nuanced branding. Dr. Kahn said, to get widespread acceptance in the public, there must be different ways of accessing the data. People will rely on the data, so authentication is important. Archives' digital copies should be verifiably authenticated to be good enough for court records or other presentations.

#### Review of Action Items and Concluding Remarks

Apart from the above motions, Dr. Martin said there were no action items and the date of the next meeting was not yet determined. He said it is probably not necessary to set up the subcommittee wikis, but members can contact Ms. Hadyka to set them up, to offer feedback, or to suggest items for the next meeting's agenda.

Dr. Woestman asked that the slides be sent further in advance so there can be less presentation and more discussion at future meetings. The discussions would be improved if the members were better informed in advance, perhaps with a highlight page or white paper.

Mr. Barth volunteered to give the Committee members a walkthrough and demonstration of the ERA process. Dr. Woestman said the walkthrough and demonstration can help user groups and agencies as well.

Ms. Dawes suggested an evaluation of how valuable ERA is to NARA and other stakeholders. Dr. Martin suggested including testimonials from other agencies engaging in ERA.

Mr. Ferriero thanked the group for their work and passion. The idea of thinking of ERA as a future legacy system is especially valuable. He thanked staff for their presentations. Dr. Martin moved adjournment. It was seconded and the meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.