

## Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee

**Agenda: 1 June 2001**

9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., Room G31, Judicial Center

Committee Members and Alternates:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)  
Karen Bondy (Department of Children, Families and Learning)  
Patricia Dunlop (Department of Transportation)  
Linda Feist (Office of the Governor)  
Marsha Haagenson (City of Minneapolis; Minneapolis Community Development Agency)  
Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)  
Vicki Henning (InterTech)  
Bob Horton (*ex officio*, Minnesota State Archives)  
Robbie LaFleur (Legislative Reference Library)  
Jim Mack (Department of Administration)  
Eileen McCormack (*ex officio*, Office of Technology)  
Eileen Quam (Department of Natural Resources)  
Steve Retzlaff (Department of Public Safety)  
Bruce Showel (Department of Revenue)  
Craig Steiner (City of Minneapolis)  
Lorraine Swick (Department of Children, Families and Learning)  
Jim Taylor (Department of Employee Relations)  
John Wiersma (Department of Economic Security)  
Bruce Yurich (Department of Employee Relations)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

- Introductions
- Re-cap of last meeting and updates from work groups
- Element discussion
  - a. Agent
- Set agenda for June 15<sup>th</sup> meeting (Court of Appeals Dining Room)

### 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>

### Minnesota

- *Preserving and Disposing of Government Records*  
<http://www.admin.state.mn.us/ipo/pipa/pipa.html> (in left-side frame, PDF format)

### Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee web site

- <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/metadev.html>

## **Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee**

### **1 June 2001**

#### Committee Members Present:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)  
Patricia Dunlop (Department of Transportation)  
Linda Feist (Office of the Governor)  
Marsha Haagenon (City of Minneapolis; Minneapolis Community Development Agency)  
Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)  
Vicki Henning (InterTech)  
Robbie LaFleur (Legislative Reference Library)  
Jim Mack (Department of Administration)  
Eileen McCormack (*ex officio*, Office of Technology)  
Steve Retzlaff (Department of Public Safety)  
Bruce Showel (Department of Revenue)  
Craig Steiner (City of Minneapolis)  
Jim Taylor (Department of Employee Relations)  
Bruce Yurich (Department of Employee Relations)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

#### Others Present:

Jay Achenbach (Office of Technology)

#### Summary Minutes

Shawn Rounds re-capped what happened at the last meeting and asked for updates from work groups.

The Office of Technology will offer another electronic document management system demo (tentatively scheduled for June 13<sup>th</sup> in the afternoon). This time, IBM's content manager will be featured. Jay Achenbach will send out more information as details become available. These demo sessions are open to anyone who is interested in attending.

Working from comments given at the last meeting, Bruce Showel revised the cost-benefit analysis grid he's devised. He gave copies to the group that including a "gambling tax return" example from the Department of Revenue. The ensuing discussion touched upon the need for agencies to evaluate what sort of records they have (using the records retention schedules as tools), and then prioritizing those records series and records as to need for recordkeeping metadata. Initial use and realization of benefits should propel further use of the standard. In some cases, it will be enough to apply to metadata at a high aggregate level (systems containing only one record type, for example), but in other instances, metadata may need to be applied at the record level (for

example, in systems containing more than one record type and/or serving multiple functions). The question was raised as to whether there are currently systems containing non-public records that do not already have some sort of access security set up. The group was able to point to many instances where that may be the case. Procedures and systems vary greatly between and within agencies. Some have access protocols, redaction methods, etc. already in place; others do not. Under the Data Practices Act, it may be the case that only portions of a record are restricted (e.g., vital records, motor vehicle registrations).

Along the lines of discussing what metadata elements are needed for any particular situation, the idea was raised of changing “mandatory” to “highly recommended”, given that variety of records the standard will be applied to and the lack of enforcing authority. The group largely felt that a basic mandatory set was necessary to establish a baseline of expected information from agencies that would serve as a foundation for such activities as information sharing and searching. One suggestion is to say that “x” set of metadata elements is necessary to make the standard work to it’s highest potential and to realize the greatest benefit.

The committee offered several suggestions for refining the formatting of the grid, and Bruce make another revision and distribute it to the group. Shawn encouraged committee members to try filling it out with some examples of their own. Bruce noted that the exercise served as an excellent method for educating other staff about the goals of this metadata project. Eileen McCormack and Jay Achenbach will see what’s been done with this sort of analysis in the past at the Office of Technology.

-----

The group continued revision of the “Agent” element and finished sub-element 1.1 Agent Type.

-----

The next committee meeting is scheduled for June 15<sup>st</sup> in the Court of Appeals Dining Room, Judicial Center. The group will continue revising the “Agent” element.