

## Retention/Preservation Subgroup

July 28, 2009

### Discussion Items

- 1) Discussion of e-mail archiving specifications with Rick Jackson

Dennis Cromwell indicated that UITS is looking at an upgrade to Microsoft Exchange and they would like to avoid going to a third-party to get e-mail archiving capability. The hope is that the base Microsoft product will provide what we need, and that it works well.

Dennis shared what he felt our intent was from our former discussions about archiving e-mail. Our intent is to move business e-mail into a central repository for long-term storage and retrieval. Also, we wanted to be able to take individual e-mail and move it into this central repository for management and long-term storage. This might help to eliminate .PST files which have proliferated across the University on personal drives and departmental servers. Another goal was that an individual would make the decision whether or not to move to central repository. If an individual does not make this determination, then at some point in time, it would be deleted from their in-box. Also, can it be sophisticated enough to eliminate duplicates? The other thing that was not talked about in this policy was how to deal with discovery holds in non-archived e-mail.

The purpose of today's meeting is to outline what we are interested in and for Rick and Dennis to see what might be possible. Rick indicated there are tools to bring back the .PST files and pull them into an Exchange environment. The next version of Exchange has a number of new features, so Rick needs to have his engineers look at what we are trying to accomplish, and see what is available and what is not. Discovery and preserving mailboxes could be difficult to resolve with Public Records requests. What will faculty do about keeping class information if we make the deletion period too short?

Kip asked about what Rick meant by mandatory compliance; both University archiving and retention schedules and outside requests for information. Paul indicated that at this point we have nothing required as far as e-mail is concerned. Kip indicated that e-mail is not dealt with separately under any regulations she is aware of. To the extent that an e-mail is subject to a litigation hold, then it must be kept. Paul posed the question as to why an automatic deletion process is anymore of concern than what we do now. Rick asked if we were talking about doing this purge on Inbox or all folders for an individual. Paul pointed out that your personal archive is not subject to deletion. We are proposing having both a personal and University archive (not .PST).

Paul cautioned that one of the operating principles is that we keep this as simple as possible. There was a great deal of discussion about the legal ramifications of an e-mail archiving system. For the most part, e-mail is inferred to be the same as paper documents now, so it shouldn't be

treated differently in an automated system. We need to have further discussion about the automated deletion period (60 days, 6 months, etc.?).

Paul pointed out that the security on such a system which allows access by some individuals or departments are allowed access, while others are not is probably the most difficult part of the system. This particularly pertains to an individual or departmental archive. Dan pointed out that having such a system would cause people to think of e-mail as more of an institutional set of documents than they do today. Making it searchable is very important. Rick asked about archiving calendar items as well.

Rick concluded by saying that he would take all of this information and come back with what is possible within Exchange 2010.

## 2) Roles & Responsibilities

Paul talked about the Data Managers – a question was raised about who does provide training, etc. There was some discussion around who owns this. Kathleen feels that this is the Data Stewards responsibility to have processes and documentation in place regarding their data. Paul agreed with Kathleen that the Data Stewards should be responsible for handling special data. The group felt departments and supervisors have responsibility to make sure the people in their areas, including Data Managers, know how to handle their data. This group felt that the Data Managers role is very limited; mostly just to give access.

### **Action Items**

1). Kathleen and Dan will send Phyllis and Paul examples for Retention spreadsheet by middle of next week.