

## Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee

**Agenda: 1 September 2000**

10:00 a.m. to 12 p.m., Pillsbury Room, Minnesota History Center

Committee Members:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)  
Katie Engler (Department of Administration)  
Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)  
Bob Horton (Minnesota State Archives)  
Jim Mack (Department of Health)  
Robert Maki (Department of Natural Resources)  
Karl Olmstead (Department of Transportation)  
Eileen Quam (Department of Natural Resources)  
Kate Severin (Department of Human Services)  
Lorraine Swick (Department of Children, Families and Learning)  
John Wiersma (Department of Economic Security)  
Brian Zaidman (Department of Labor and Industry)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

1. Organizational and administrative details
2. Goals, purpose, products
3. Schedule for project
4. Overview of Australian system: background information and references

### National Archives of Australia

- *Recordkeeping in the Commonwealth: A New Approach*. (overview)  
<http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/overview/summary.html>
- *Recordkeeping Metadata Standard for Commonwealth Agencies*  
<http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/control/summary.html>

### Supporting Guidelines and Documentation

- *Designing and Implementing Recordkeeping Systems (DIRKS)*  
<http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/dirks/summary.html>
- *Commonwealth Record Series Manual (CRS)*  
[http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/control/CRS\\_summary.html](http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/control/CRS_summary.html)
- *Developing a Functions Thesaurus: Guidelines for Commonwealth Agencies*  
[http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/control/functions\\_thesaur/intro.html](http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/control/functions_thesaur/intro.html)
- *Australian Government Locator Service (AGLS)*  
[http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/gov\\_online/agls/summary.html](http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/gov_online/agls/summary.html)

## **Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee Summary minutes from 1 September 2000 meeting**

Future meetings will be held on Fridays from 9:00 to 11:00 (dates and locations to be determined).

Time will be set aside near the end of each meeting to set the agenda for the next one and to agree upon what participants need to do.

Progress reports (and drafts of final report) will be made available in November or December to DIG-IT and MN GRIN members for comment.

The membership of this committee will be closed to newcomers after the second meeting (unless someone sends a substitute). Minutes, agendas, and related information will be posted online (either State Archives or DIG-IT site) for outside comment. When available, a notice will be sent to the DIG-IT, MN GRIN, and IPC e-mail lists.

Goal of the committee from the IPC proposal reads: "The feasibility study would include examination of implementation in Australia; determination of whether the Australian standard is suitable for adaptation in Minnesota; determination of what metadata would be appropriate for Minnesota state government agencies; and recommendations on how to actually develop and deliver the new standard in a practical, timely, cost-effective manner." Need to decide who are the "customers" of the committee's work, what committee product will be, what are the various aspects of committee recommendations. Difficult to enforce a mandatory standard, but can get the support of the IPC and the Office of Technology. Agencies would decide what systems and records to apply the standard to, at what level, etc. Need to be careful that committee stays focused, not trying to set metadata strategy for entire state. If the Australian standard won't work, will need to give recommendations on how to attack problem (but don't need to provide solution).

Need to consider many questions as committee studies Australian standard (see appended list).

Committee has permission from Adrian Cunningham, Director of the Recordkeeping and Standards Policy Office of the National Archives of Australia, to copy or adapt the standard. All they ask for is proper acknowledgement as the source. More information will be coming from them regarding implementation, future plans, etc. Need to be aware of what changes are coming down the road and decide whether or not any related standard in Minnesota would change as well. At the very least need to stay educated on why changes are being made.

There is no similar recordkeeping metadata standard in the U.S., although some states may have their own schemes. Dublin Core is a standard in wide use here (U.S. and Minnesota) and abroad. The Australian recordkeeping metadata standard is building on an Australian recordkeeping system standard (AS 4390, 1996) that is currently in the works as an ISO standard (ISO 15489).

Are there other standards committee should be aware of?

At next meeting, committee should define common terms, points of view, and develop set of criteria for evaluating the elements of the AU standard – a sort of rating system for decision and comparison. The business case developed by the committee at this meeting (see below) should be the base. Other things to consider include what the law requires, how an item fits with how Minnesota currently does business, how business might be done in the future, stated goals of the present administration, best practices, return on investment, etc.

What is a record? (not exhaustive)

- \* evidence of a business transaction
- \* can be paper or electronic
- \* includes reports, correspondence, database entries, web pages, etc.

## BUSINESS CASE FOR RECORDKEEPING METADATA STANDARD

For IT staff, business users, others

In no particular order (and with redundancies):

- Reduce risk of improper access to, or use of, records (Minnesota Government Data Practices Act (MGDPA) compliance, for electronic government services (EGS), for search and retrieval (Government Information Locator Service (GILS))
- Reduce costs by
  - reducing redundancy
  - eliminating records kept beyond retention periods
  - not having to develop own standard within agency
- Facilitate location and retrieval of records (GILS, for litigation, business use, etc.)
  - Increase public access
- Improve records management
  - sorting and management of records (historical versus non-historical)
  - access limitations (MGDPA)
  - storage, migration, preservation management
  - applying retention periods
- Reducing paperwork (increasing agencies' confidence in locating and managing electronic records may lessen use of hard copies)
  - Digital signatures
  - Official version in electronic form
- Reduction of errors
- Greater consistency within and across agencies
- Facilitate sharing (when appropriate and allowed by law) within and across agencies
  - know what info is available and what isn't
  - cross-agency queries (Big Plan component?)
- Standards are better than ad-hoc, agency-specific schemes
  - Cheaper and easier to use standard rather than developing own
- Standards for consultants and vendors
  - For easy reference, consistency
  - Agency projects could piggy-back on what others have done
- Pointers to other related metadata (data dictionaries, etc. – metadata for metadata)

- Accountability to citizens

# Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee

## Proposed Items for Consideration

What is the business case for a recordkeeping metadata standard?

From data administration side?

From records management side?

Will the Australian standard work in Minnesota?

What are the concerns?

Is it flexible and extensible?

What other metadata standards / schemes would it work with?

Does it conflict with any current standards?

Would it work with the Foundations metadata and/or a GILS?

What would need to be done to adapt the standard for use here?

What metadata elements could be used?

What portions would need to be changed?

What are the foreseeable practical problems of development and implementation?

Possible solutions?

Who should be involved in creating the new standard?

What should the process be?

What should the product be?