

# DRAFT

## MEMORANDUM

April 8, 1997

To:

From: Robert Skwirot

Subject: Working Outline of New Procedures for Review of Documents

Documents received from CIA

- Bob checks them in and divides them among the team members according to area of specialty.

Analyst review

- Initial survey by analyst to sort routine postponements from those which require further negotiation with the agency. Check for issues that may be disputed and for postponements recommended by the CIA which were already released in the previous review. Check also for new issues that require Board guidance.

- Mechanics of review

- If CIA's recommended postponements are acceptable by current Board standards

- Confirm CIA's redaction with red brackets [ ]. Our hope is to be able to use the review copy as the document which CIA sends through the redactor machine to produce the final product that will go to NARA. Their redacting machine will filter those areas which are highlighted. Because of this technical requirement the brackets must be outside the highlighted area.

- Write the postponement code in the space above the redaction, also in red. (See list.) This is a temporary reference code. We expect that the redactor machine will filter out the postponement codes with the redactions. In an effort to produce a clean final product, CIA will enter the postponement code in the blank space created by the redactor. (While all of these procedures are open to modification, the issues concerning substitute language codes- who enters them and where they are entered- are most fluid right now since they are still under discussion with CIA.)

- Since the name issue has not yet been resolved, names should still be tracked on the name lists. However, since individual postponements are

# DRAFT

not tracked on any database, a single "N" code list of the names that appear in a particular document can be attached to the front of the document or entered on the database. Upon resolution of this issue, this step will no longer be necessary.

-The analyst counts the number of postponements on each page. In a circle (possibly an ARRB stamp) placed at the bottom of each page (lower right corner unless it interferes with text of the document), she or he records the number of postponements on that page. In the circle, she or he also writes her or his initials. The number of releases of former postponements no longer needs to be counted. Pages without recommended postponements do not need initials.

-At some point of this process some basic data entry still needs to be done: document action date (the earliest postponement date in the document), total number of postponements in the document, and new status of the document.

We may wind up entering the "N" codes also. Chet has created a new database which is currently called Fast Track. It seems that the time to do the basic data entry is when all of the postponements have been approved by the analyst, the substitute language codes written, and each page initialed- in short, when the analyst is satisfied that the entire document meets current Board standards. When this data entry is done, the document will be ready to move forward to the Board and Federal Register notification. The database should be able to record the name of the analyst along with the document.

-Some kind of information needs to be placed on the RIF page (top of the document) that indicates that it has been reviewed by the analyst -- maybe initialed and dated.

-If supervisory review is required, some mechanism for this verification needs to be established.

-Lists of documents will be given to the Board for approval, and Kevin will assign them an agenda date after they have been approved by the Board.

-Explanations:

-The Final Determination Forms will no longer have data for each postponement. It will only have the total number of postponements in the document, a key to the postponement codes and, if a particular postponement does not fit the standard codes, an explanation of that postponement.

-Review or release dates will be linked to the substitute language

# DRAFT

codes. The key to the postponement codes will include the substitute language, the clause of the statute under which the item has been postponed, and the date for that type of postponement.

We hope that there will only be three dates: 10/2017, 08/2008, & 05/2006.

-After Board approval, the documents are returned to CIA and documents are prepared for NARA. CIA sends them to us and the final product is checked, how closely dependant upon how confident we become of the Agency's accuracy.

-If the postponements do not meet current Board guidelines additional negotiations with the Agency will be needed. Discussions among our staff will yield the most efficient means by which this will be accomplished.

-Manuel has offered the following suggestions in this area:

- We may need to include a section on what happens to the documents that are separated from the rest of the documents due to "new board guidance needed" and "disputed" issues. For example, we could say:

"Once these documents are separated out, they will be placed in two shelves in our SCIF that are labeled "new issues for Board" and "Disputed." A list of the "disputed" items will be kept and the documents will brought to the attention of the CIA by (staff member)."

Additionally, maybe we could keep a master list or table of documents that are referred back to the CIA, with a part of the table indicating the current disposition of the document. For example, a table with the following topics might work:

RIF Number	Analyst	Date referred to CIA	Date returned to ARRB
------------	---------	----------------------	-----------------------

Irene also offered the following suggestions in this area:

I think we should say more about cases where we don't agree with the CIA postponements. Barry told me that when we have a disagreement or question about a postponement we should take them over to Cathy or Dick and tell them how we think it should be changed. If they can't address it on the spot, they will

# DRAFT

coordinate with the appropriate authorities. We should also pay attention to the folder number and if there are problems within a particular folder or with similar types of documents take them over as a group. In some cases the entire folder may be flawed in which case they will send it back to be re-done. We should probably try to get as many "green" cases out the door as possible, then concentrate on the problem issues.

4.0.1.0

e:\arrb1\data\bskwiro\newrevu.wpd