

Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee

Agenda: 6 October 2000

9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Room 1C, Department of Human Services (444 Lafayette Road)

Committee Members:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)
Karen Bondy (Department of Children, Families and Learning) – *absent*
Gretchen Domian (Department of Revenue)
Katie Engler (Department of Administration) – *absent*
Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)
Bob Horton (Minnesota State Archives) – *absent*
Robbie LaFleur (Legislative Reference Library) – *1st meeting*
Jim Mack (Department of Administration)
Robert Maki (Department of Natural Resources) – *absent*
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. Review evaluation criteria
2. Check criteria and evaluation procedure against “Agent” and “Date” elements
3. Evaluate elements
4. Set agenda for October 20th meeting

Minnesota

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

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>

Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee Summary minutes from 6 October 2000 meeting

Shawn handed out a draft outline for the committee's final report. Broken down into a number of sections including findings, recommendations, issues outside of scope, and glossary. Subject to change as the group sees fit. She will update it as the group goes along.

Review of evaluation criteria (revised copy appended)

Developed at last meeting. Broken down into general questions regarding entire standard and element-level items. Some of the general ones we may not be able to answer in this group and may have to refer to whoever develops the actual standard (should that be our recommendation).

What are some of the other metadata standards in use in state government? Foundations web metadata (Dublin Core), the Minnesota Geographic Metadata Guidelines (GIS based on federal standard). No formal standards for databases, records management, document management. Jim Harris has been compiling a list and will e-mail to group members.

Under general questions, how standard will work with various software packages is beyond the scope of this group, but we should keep it in mind as a future issue to point to. Agencies will probably need to work with vendors/IT to implement elements or there may need to be a translation or crosswalk between the standard and various packages (smaller agencies may not have the financial ability to customize).

General Discussion

The Australian's have a hierarchy of record series, file level, item level. Minnesota does not have something comparable to file level. Loosely defined, a record series consists of records related to one another because they relate to a particular subject or function or result from the same activity. We must use the statutory definition of "record" here in Minnesota. Not all documents are records. Not all records are documents (may be databases, e-mail, web pages, etc.).

Still question of how to deal with e-mail. It can be a record and when it is, it should meet standard, but perceived as difficult to deal with. Is e-mail a record series? Treated like correspondence – content, not format, is what's important, but need to be mindful of things like attachments, etc.

While we don't have to work out all the details, we can recommend which elements should be mandatory.

Ideally, we would reference an ISO recordkeeping metadata standard (or one from a similar group) rather than Australia's, but there isn't one. Australian standard based on Dublin Core, GILS, etc. – likely that any international standard will be similar. Department of Defense's 5015.2 (<http://jitic.fhu.disa.mil/recmgt/#standard>) is a design criteria standard for federal records management applications that has similar metadata requirements.

There's too many differences between Minnesota government operations and those in Australia to just allow for straight adoption. Will need to review names, language, etc. to make it consistent with how we do business. Will need to create new value lists (and agencies will need to do this internally also) as well as minimum/maximum number specifications for sub-elements. Will need to make scheme lists Minnesota-specific.

Agencies must be allowed to add their own extension elements to meet their own business needs.

We should point out that current interpretations of federal law place importance on keeping metadata about actual opening/reading of electronic documents beyond just receipt.

Perhaps this group can act as an advisory body to whomever is charged with actually developing/adapting the standard.

Need to keep in mind business needs as we go through the standard and make recommendations on mandatory or optional.

The purpose of a recordkeeping metadata standard is not to have everyone do the exact same thing, but to give a common language for action.

Evaluation of “Agent” element

1. Will [specific element] apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?
Yes.
2. Does [specific element] facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?
Yes.
3. Does [specific element] accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?
Yes.
4. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?
Yes.
5. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?
Yes.
6. How applicable is [specific element] to non-electronic records?
Very applicable.
7. Is [specific element] part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (e.g., Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?
Similar to Contributor, author, publisher in DC scheme. Originator in federal GILS scheme. Author, publisher in GIS.
8. How easy is it to capture [specific element]? Can it be automatically captured and, if so, how?
If an element is considered important enough in terms of business needs to be mandatory, ease of capture should not be a factor.
9. Should [specific element] be mandatory or optional?
Mandatory.

There is nothing under “Agent” per se. All information under this element (and the others) is contained within the sub-elements. To layer metadata information and capture all the information an agency might want to, Agent and its associated sub-elements are repeatable.

Under values for Agent Type, should Document Author and Record Creator be collapsed together?

Probably the “Section” sub-element should be re-titled “Organizational Unit” for Minnesota purposes.

If agency-specific codes are used for values, agencies will need to keep those codes even after they change for at least as long as the longest retention period of the records whose metadata references those codes.

Rather than saying “uses” records, say “manages” records to avoid confusion with the end users of the records.

The audit trail of record use may itself become a record (e-commerce example of someone reading and accepting terms of use).

Evaluation of “Date” element

Mandatory.

Should “Time” also be mandatory? Must be a business need. Not always available. Not generally tracked for non-electronic records. Need to have standard format and explicit statement that time references are for Minnesota time zone.

Date can be a range for a series, specific for an individual record.

>> can't finish this today, will pick up with evaluation criteria at next meeting.

Criteria for Evaluating Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard

6 October 2000

In no particular order:

General:

- Does the standard facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?
- Can the standard accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?
- Is the standard easy to educate people about?
- Will the standard work with disparate systems?
- Can the standard be implemented using a wide array of software (i.e., document management, e-mail, databases, web, etc.)?

Element Level:

1. Will [specific element] apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?
2. Does [specific element] facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?
3. Does [specific element] accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?
4. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?
5. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?
6. How applicable is [specific element] to non-electronic records?
7. Is [specific element] part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (e.g., Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?
8. How easy is it to capture [specific element]? Can it be automatically captured and, if so, how?
9. Should [specific element] be mandatory or optional?

Other items to consider:

- indication of versions of records
- indication of language of records