This E-mail will outline our general goals and possible policy options for the handling of name documents. I believe that once policy options have been decided on that we should have a meeting to discuss implementation of a "name plan".

I should apologize to the CIA team for the numerous drafts that were sent out before. This represents the final draft of this memo.

Sincerely,
Manuel E. Legaspi
Your friendly neighborhood Name Czar

General goals:
To provide some way of tracking the occurrence of names in CIA documents so as to facilitate:
1) An organized manner in which the release or postponement of name redactions is handled.
        a) The procedures for accomplishing this task will be based, in part, on the manner in   which the CIA wi

2) Provide us with a way of tracking this information, by
        -name,
        -document RIF #,
        -page # and redaction #,
        -date of analyst review,
        -date on which the document was previously handled by the board.

        The requirements of this new system would vary. As our needs change, so would the requirements. This would necessitate the creation of a system flexible enough to accommodate rapidly growing informational needs.

Procedural options/ideas:

        Option 1. - To create a new classified database.

To utilize a software system, like Excel, where the information desired (actual names, document RIF #, page# and redaction#, etc.) is input into the classified database for manipulation by the staff. The benefits of choosing this option are:
1)the data would be "direct" (actual names could be input) , and easily utilized
        a) cross-referencing and searching for data would be simple and straightforward;
        b) such a system would eliminate the need to devise a new "coding" system to maintain   the unclassified
2) Excel is a very fast and easy to use software package.

Drawbacks include:
1) This system would involve a tremendous amount of data entry on the part of the analyst.
2) Data would not be as easily accessible nor interconnected with the Review Track (TM) system. (see option 2, benefit #2)
3) An **automated** backup system does not exist for SCIF computers, although a backup system of sorts could be created using floppy disks.
4) Staff would require training and support on a new software package.
5) The creation of a new database may bring up security concerns and involve the generation of additional paper documents which may eventually become "assassination records".

Option 2 - To use the existing Review Track System to accomplish our data handling needs

To expand the present system by adding a coded (thus maintaining the unclassified integrity of Review Track)   system to the review process to monitor the occurrence of names in the documents.   This could be accomplished by having a pop-up screen when a 1a/v-code 85 redaction is selected.   The screen would allow the analyst to choose the appropriate code for the name that appears.   For example:

If person "John Doe" appears in a document, the analyst would find that name on a classified master list of names, and enter the code number assigned for that person.   That data could then be called up and organized for presentation if the need should arise, e.g. if the CIA announces before "name day" that "John Doe" can be released.

Advantages include:
1) Eliminates the need for new software and the maintenance of a separate computer system.
2) It would link the rest of the review process with the tracking of names. In other words, "name data" can be called up alongside all of the additional information also stored on RT.   For example:
            - An analyst or supervisor, in calling up all documents in which the name "John   Doe" ap
            - This would, of course, provide us with better accessibility and flexibility than option   #1.
3) It would provide us with greater potential for an upgrade of the system if it is needed.

Disadvantages include:
1) The coding system would necessitate the creation of excessive paper documents which may eventually become assassination records ("master lists" would need to be created and updated, on a regular basis).
2)In addition, there would be a definite need to create a backup system, either handwritten or computer generated, for such a database.
3) Such a system may further complicate the Review Track process on Lotus Notes.
4) The creation of another field on Review Track would add to the slowness of the system.

Staff concerns

Jeremy has indicated that he would prefer that the staff photocopy name documents.   According to the "Gunn system", tracking names would be accomplished by making a clear copy of the name documents and placing them in a name-specific folder, complete with RIF #.

The staff has expressed concern that this would lead to an enormous amount of copying and filing, which would further bog down the review process.   Carrying out this method out would appear to be troublesome.