

NR_key_name: 3504240CD7CF83FC8525638700602375
SendTo: CN=Chet Rhodes/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Mary McAuliffe/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Kevin Tiernan/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Bob Skwirot/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 08/15/1996
DisplayDate_Time: 2:05:38 PM
ComposedDate: 08/15/1996
ComposedDate_Time: 1:30:05 PM
Subject: Problems with Final Determination Forms

After again printing the 228 FDFs for the June meeting, I found a number of problems with them. First, postponements have multiplied. For about 30 documents, two of each postponement print on the FDF even though there was only one of each on the Determination Summary. Second, for documents such as the MC Chron which have a large number of postponements, only a few, or none, of the postponements print on the FDF. These documents are getting ripe for NARA, so the sooner we can straighten this out the better. This causes some concern. I thought we had reached the point where we could be confident that the FDFs would be accurate if the Determination Summary was right. I had hoped that a careful check of the FDFs against the Summary would not be necessary, but now I wonder. Let's talk about this. In addition, I have a procedural question regarding how to handle changes at this late phase of the life of a document. If, for example, CIA releases a name that the Board had postponed, is it adequate to edit the FDF and save it, rather than to go through the whole process of changing the postponement detail, updating the RIF and voting information, and running the renumbering macro. Editing the FDF is easier and, I think, better, as it leaves intact the Board action as noticed in the Federal Register. What do you think?

Body:
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: