

## Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee

**Agenda: 8 February 2002**

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

Committee Members and Alternates:

Jay Achenbach (Office of Technology)  
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)  
Jennifer Johnson (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
  - Element discussion
    - a. Review Disposal and Management History (event types)
    - b. Record Identifier
    - c. Fitness for Use / Quality (proposed)
- Set agenda for February 22<sup>th</sup> meeting, Room G31, Judicial Center

### 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/>

### Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee web site

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

## **Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee**

### **8 February 2002**

#### Committee Members Present:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)  
Patricia Dunlop (Department of Transportation)  
Vicki Henning (InterTech)  
Jennifer Johnson (Minnesota State Archives)  
Robbie LaFleur (Legislative Reference Library)  
Steve Retzlaff (Department of Public Safety)  
Jim Taylor (Department of Employee Relations)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

#### Summary Minutes:

Shawn Rounds reported on her update to the IPC's Executive Committee. They were very happy to hear that this group is on schedule and will deliver the standard in a few months. Shawn stressed that this standard will be one more tool for agencies to use for records management, certainly an important consideration if the Department of Administration is successful in removing itself from any central, coordinating role in records management as that agency has proposed.

Shawn also wrote to Adrian Cunningham at the National Archives of Australia. Mr. Cunningham coordinates the use of their standard. He commented that they will be starting revisions on their Version 1 very soon. Implementation there has been slow, but those who have adopted the standard are generally pleased with it. Also, agencies are beginning to write it into specifications for records/document management software, a good thing as vendors take note of what their customers want. Tower Software anticipates that the next version of TRIM software will be compliant with the standard.

The group reviewed Disposal and Management History event types, making a few corrections to the current draft.

The group revised Record Identifier. Vicki Henning pointed out that InterTech uses a two-character alphabetic identifier for agencies and that the Department of Finance's MAPS system uses an agency code system comprised of both numbers and letters. These will be referenced in the comments field as there is, at present, no single agency identification system nor any clearinghouse for coordinating record identifiers across agencies.

The group had a lengthy discussion regarding whether Fitness for Use or Quality had a place within this metadata standard. The two competing proposals were the product of two members of the study committee. Both come from the idea that there should be some sort of measure to indicate a record's completeness, currency, accuracy, etc. The first question asked was: in both cases, is this really recordkeeping metadata? Is record content quality something that we track right now in our paper records management systems? While quality information is subjective, it may be useful and pertinent in certain instances for certain users. The group discussed examples of these situations. But, the group decided, it's not recordkeeping metadata because it does not aid in the management of the record (does not inform retention, access constraints, preservation

actions, etc.) nor does it aid in the discovery/location of the record (as do title, subject, coverage, and others). If an agency feels that such information must accompany the record, it can use Description to detail it, or the agency can use the recordkeeping metadata set in conjunction with another data/record-content metadata scheme (such as the Land Management Information Center's GIS standard) which explicitly addresses quality (many agencies have these in some form or another). Given these considerations, the group voted to not include either Fitness for Use or Quality in this particular standard.

The next meeting will be on February 22nd, in Room G31, Judicial Center. Shawn will send an e-mail to members explaining what will be on the agenda. She anticipates that at least part of the meeting will be devoted to cleaning up those odd "we'll come back to this" items.