19 January 1999 4 February 1999 4 March 1999 27 April 1999

19 JANUARY 1999, 1:30 P.M.

Present: Charles Arp, Rae Cogar, Charles Corbato, Suzanne Farrar, Gina Fulk, Elizabeth Nelson, Pam Spetter, Debbie Swank, Carol Volle, Jane Wildermuth

Absent: Ann Bowers, Dale Darnell, Barbara Floyd, Laurie Gemmill, Mike Hardenbrook, Bob Myers, Jill Tatem

- **I.** Members introduced themselves to the subcommittee.
- **II.** Arp presented an overview/background of the ERC Committee.
- **III.** Arp explained the charge of the subcommittee:
 - **A.** to examine several different e-mail retention guidelines and to adopt or create e-mail retention guidelines by consensus
 - **B.** to define the relationship between e-mail use policy and e-mail retention guidelines
 - C. to provide implementation strategies for e-mail retention guidelines
 - **D.** to provide specific examples for scheduling e-mail
- **IV.** Volle stated that the committee must first come to an agreement of terminology to be used in policy/guidelines
 - A. Discussion of the definition of e-mail followed
 - **B.** The subcommittee agreed that definitions were needed not simply for email, but for e-mail messages and the e-mail process (system)
 - **C.** Cogar agreed to define e-mail messages and the e-mail process and post these definitions for comment to the erc-em listserv by 26 January 1999
- V. Volle stated that the next term needing defining was transitory messages
 - **A.** After some discussion by the subcommittee, Arp agreed to define this term and post it for comment to the erc-em listserv by 26 January 1999
- VI. Volle asked for discussion on the issue of who is the responsible party
 - **A.** A.Discussion followed on whether the recipient, sender or both were the responsible party
 - **B.** B.Volle agreed to define responsible party and post it for comment to the erc-em listserv by 26 January 1999
- VII. Cogar presented the issue of when e-mail is considered received
 - **A.** Corbato agreed to define when e-mail is considered received and post it for comment to the erc-em listserv by 26 January 1999

- VIII. Volle brought up the issue of appropriate use of e-mail
 - **A.** Arp agreed to post OPP's draft use policy and write a definition based on said policy. He will post it for comment to the erc-em listserv by 26 January 1999.
 - **IX.** Corbato asked Arp to provide an overview of what is required by law in terms of records retention
 - **X.** Volle stated that at the next meeting the subcommittee will focus on the large issues which must be covered in the policy, ie. definitions, use, technology, retention
 - **XI.** Volle asked subcommittee members to present any other terms to be defined at the next meeting
- **XII.** Corbato will set up a listserv for the subcommittee. The address will be erc-em@regents.state.oh.us
- **XIII.** The next meeting will be held at the Ohio Historical Society 4 February 1999 at 1:30 p.m. The meeting room will be announced at a later date.

4 FEBRUARY 1999

Present: Charles Arp, Ann Bowers, Rae Cogar, Charles Corbato, Barbara Floyd, Gina Fulk, Shervelda George, Mike Hardenbrook, Bob Myers, Pamela Spetter, Jill Tatem, Carol Volle, Jane Wildermuth

Absent: Dale Darnell, Suzanne Farrar, Laurie Gemmill, Elizabeth Nelson, Debbie Swank

- **I.** Members introduced themselves to the subcommittee.
- **II.** Arp presented an overview of records management obligations for state agencies based on the Ohio Revised Code
- **III.** After some discussion consensus was reached on the following terminology
 - **A.** E-MAIL: Any electronic correspondence created and sent or received by a computer system. This definition applies equally to the contents of the communication, the transactional information and any attachments associated with such communication.
 - **B.** E-MAIL PROCESS: Members decided this definition was not necessary
 - C. RESPONSIBLE PARTY: Each employee is responsible for the proper identification, classification, retention and disposition of all messages sent and received including all appropriate metadata and attachments. They are further responsible for the transferring of e-mail messages to their successor and /or to an approved archival repository.
 - **D.** TRANSITORY MESSAGE: Includes all informal or temporary messages such as those meant to convey information in lieu of oral communication, notes, drafts, unsolicited messages, and listserv outputs. Retention value until no longer of administrative value
 - **E.** WHEN IS E-MAIL RECEIVED: Members discussed of the difficulty of ensuring the accuracy of time on servers and PC's. They then decided not to included this as a part of the terminology section of the policy. This term will be included as a topic under things to consider.
- **IV.** Volle asked for other terminology to be defined. There was none at this time.
- V. Volle presented the need for a basic understanding for all subcommittee members of how e-mail systems work. She asked for volunteers to present an overview at the next meeting.
 - **A.** Corbato and Myers agreed to complete this task. And asked the other subcommittee members to post to the em-erc listserv questions/concerns that they would like answered. Please post by 11 February 1999.
- **VI.** The next meeting of the E-mail Subcommittee will be held at the Ohio Historical Center on 26 February 1999 at 1:30pm. The meeting room will be announced at a later date.

4 MARCH 1999

Present: Charles Arp, Rae Cogar, Charles Corbato, R. Dale Darnell, Suzanne Farrar, Barbara Floyd, Laurie Gemmill, Gina Fulk, Mike Hardenbrook, Bob Myers, Elizabeth Nelson, Pam Spetter, Debbie Swank, Jill Tatem, Carol Volle, Jane Wildermuth

Absent: Ann Bowers

- **I.** Bob Myers and Charles Corbato presented a technical overview of how the e-mail process works. These presentations were followed by a question and answer session (see handouts)
- **II.** Volle listed sections that should be included in the E-mail policy
 - A. Scope
 - **B.** Intent and purpose
 - C. E-mail as defined by committee and law
 - **D.** E-mail as a public record
 - E. Retention guidelines
 - F. Responsible party
 - **G.** System issues and recommendations
- **III.** Volle asked the committee members for any additional sections that should be included in the policy
- **IV.** After some discussion, committee members agreed with Volle's sections
- **V.** Committee members volunteered to work on writing the following sections and post them to the listserv by 26 March
 - A. Scope Charles Arp
 - **B.** Intent and purpose Charles Arp
 - C. E-mail as defined by committee and law Rae Cogar
 - **D.** E-mail as a public records Rae Cogar
 - E. Retention guidelines Jane Wildermuth, Gina Fulk, Pamela Spetter
 - F. Responsible Party Carol Volle
 - G. System issues and recommendations Charles Arp, Charles Corbato, Bob Myers
- **VI.** Committee members discussed the definition of the responsible party and whether to include the system administrator in this definition. Members concluded that the system administrator should not be included in this definition.
- **VII.** Discussion then followed on what to do with the e-mail of an employees once he/she resigns or leaves that position. Members agreed that decisions concerning e-mail should be included as a part of a signing out process.
- **VIII.** The next meeting of the E-mail Subcommittee will be held 6 April 1999 at 1:00 p.m. at the Ohio Historical Center

27 APRIL 1999, 1:00 P.M.

Present: Charles Arp, Rae Cogar, Charles Corbato, Suzanne Farrar, Barbara Floyd, Laurie Gemmill, Mike Hardenbrook, Elizabeth Nelson, Debbie Swank, Carol Volle, Jane Wildermuth

Absent: Ann Bowers, Dale Darnell, Gina Fulk, Bob Myers, Pam Spetter, Jill Tatem

- **I.** Volle presented the draft e-mail policy she complied from earlier submissions of subcommittee members.
- **II.** Sub-committee members discussed and edited the draft policy
 - A. Major points of discussion
 - **1.** Sub-committee members agreed on the necessity of the section on responsible party.
 - **2.** Sub-committee members agreed on revising E-Mail Management Strategies section as advised by Jill Tatem.
 - **a.** Nelson submitted Variables and Issues and Best Practices to be incorporated into this section (see attachment).
 - **b.** Strategy models will be moved to an appendix.

III. Editing/Revisions

- **A.** Volle will edit draft policy and forward it to Nelson.
- **B.** Nelson will revise the E-Mail Management Strategies and review/edit the policy.
- **C.** Policy will be forwarded to Gemmill by 30 April. 1999 for posting to the ERC webpage.
- **D.** Policy will be presented to ERC, excluding the models.
- E. Models will be revised by Nelson and Arp
- **IV.** IV. Sub-committee dismissed. Members did not see it necessary to meet again.

ATTACHMENTS

VARIABLES

Centralized or distributed storage

- Messages stored on a server
- Messages stored on local client machines

Directory/filing structure

Messages filed by:

- subject
- subject/retention period
- retention period
- record series

- case or file number
- date
- recipient/sender's name

Retention and disposal responsibility

- Employee classifies and deletes or preserves all messages
- Employee classifies messages and server administrator deletes or preserves
- Employee classifies messages and records manager deletes or preserves

Storage format

- Messages stored in e-mail system
- Messages exported from e-mail system to another electronic format
- Messages preserved using electronic records management software
- Messages printed and stored as hard copies

ISSUES AND BEST PRACTICES

Access: Records are retained because they serve some administrative, legal or historical purpose, and therefore must be accessible to authorized employees.

Best practice: messages are stored in a logical filing scheme that is searchable by multiple data elements (date or time, keyword, name, case or file number).

Format: Records should be maintained in a format that preserves all contextual information or metadata. As technology evolves, records must be refreshed or migrated.

Best practice: messages are maintained in original e-mail system or an approved electronic records management system.

Security: Unauthorized access to records must be prohibited by policy and procedure.

Best practice: creator or recipient makes all decisions regarding messages. Appropriate measures are taken to preserve data integrity, confidentiality and physical security.

Ease of Use: To achieve full compliance with agency procedures, those procedures must be relatively easy to use and should parallel procedures for managing paper records.

Best practice: whenever possible, let the system to the work, prompting employees to enter data and select from pre-defined choices or automatically performing routine tasks.

Responsibility: Employees must understand and carry out their role in records management and agencies must ensure compliance with Ohio law.

Best practice: agencies adopt procedures, train staff and monitor compliance on a regular basis.