

## ACCOUNTABILITY EXPOSURE ANALYSIS

**Accountability Exposure Analysis (AEA):** appraisal of the extent to which the agency is/is not fulfilling its legal/other responsibilities under recordkeeping statutes and other obligations, plus likelihood agency will be called to account. Outcome determines appropriate management and recordkeeping responses.

LOW LEVEL	MODERATE LEVEL	HIGH LEVEL
<p><b>Characteristics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ single website</li> <li>▶ copies of official publications</li> <li>▶ controlled postings</li> <li>▶ publications not controversial</li> <li>▶ publications never litigated and little or no legal risk</li> <li>▶ publications do not generate bad press</li> <li>▶ constituents are satisfied with website</li> <li>▶ little legislative interest</li> </ul>	<p><b>Characteristics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ number of complex websites</li> <li>▶ many offices posting to the websites</li> <li>▶ overlapping and conflicting information</li> <li>▶ both static and interactive websites</li> <li>▶ unique original materials on websites</li> <li>▶ legal counsel was not consulted</li> <li>▶ some adverse and controversial reaction</li> <li>▶ variety of management controls</li> </ul>	<p><b>Characteristics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ more numerous &amp; complex websites with subsites</li> <li>▶ contain bulletin boards, publications, unique original materials, hearings, and real time business</li> <li>▶ different administrative arrangements</li> <li>▶ public scrutiny; publications are controversial</li> <li>▶ substantial liability; frequently litigated</li> <li>▶ frequent press coverage; public interest groups monitor sites</li> <li>▶ active and vigilant legislative interest</li> <li>▶ public is clamoring for more</li> </ul>
<p><b>Records Management Analysis:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ satisfactory; no further measures necessary; periodic review of website for changes.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Records Management Analysis:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ additional measures should be taken to reconstruct prior versions</li> </ul>	<p><b>Records Management Analysis:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ requires precise reconstruction of exact copies of past contents</li> </ul>
<p><b>Recordkeeping Response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ adequate documentation</li> <li>▶ records already in recordkeeping systems (paper and electronic)</li> <li>▶ snapshot of entire website to WSA at least once every year.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Recordkeeping Response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ maintain directory listings of websites</li> <li>▶ snapshot of entire website to WSA at every significant version change or at least once every year, whichever occurs first</li> <li>▶ snapshots into the agency recordkeeping system and retention schedules applied</li> </ul>	<p><b>Recordkeeping Response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ maintain regular sequential directory listings of website changes</li> <li>▶ periodic snapshots of entire website (weekly, monthly)</li> <li>▶ snapshot of entire website to WSA at every significant version change</li> <li>▶ snapshots into the agency recordkeeping system and retention schedules applied</li> </ul>

**CREDIT:** McClure, Charles R. and J. Timothy Sprehe, Analysis and Development of Model Quality Guidelines for Electronic Records Management on State and Federal Websites, January 1998.