

Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee

Agenda: 10 August 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)
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. Rights Management
 - b. Function
- Set agenda for August 24th meeting (Room G31)

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

10 August 2001

Committee Members Present:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)

Linda Feist (Office of the Governor)

Marsha Haagenon (City of Minneapolis; Minneapolis Community Development Agency)

Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)

Jennifer Johnson (Minnesota State Archives)

Jim Mack (Department of Administration)

Eileen Quam (Department of Natural Resources)

Steve Retzlaff (Department of Public Safety)

Bruce Showel (Department of Revenue)

Lorraine Swick (Department of Children, Families and Learning)

Jim Taylor (Department of Employee Relations)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

Summary Minutes:

Bruce Showel and Jim Harris reported on a meeting they had with Katie Engler (Information Policy Analysis Division, Department of Administration) regarding state and federal regulations on access and use. These are easiest to handle at the record level or above, rather than at the data element level. Also, because government entities have different requirements for data exchange and sharing that are often very fluid, this metadata standard should not try to address those, but, instead, the entities themselves should keep track of their own requirements.

In light of these factors, they recommended adding a sub-element under “Rights Management” to allow for other requirements (e.g., federal, courts). The optional, repeatable sub-element would indicate if there were additional classifications or restrictions beyond those in the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act (MGDPA). Bruce and Jim will produce a draft of this sub-element and send it to the group for comment.

The above-mentioned items were summarized in a proposal (appended) that was sent to the committee before the meeting. The proposal should probably be incorporated into the implementation guide, but needs to be finalized first.

Jim Harris asked the committee whether he and others should continue exploring implementation issues, particularly XML as a possible means of a metadata and data interchange. The committee expressed strong support for continued work in this area and urged Jim to pursue, probably through an e-mail to the Information Policy Council, other agency partners to collaborate in the design and testing of such a system.

The group finished revision of the “Rights Management” element. It was decided that several sub-elements would be deleted and the proposed one added: (2.1) MGDPA Classification (2.2) Other Classification (2.3) Usage Conditions (2.4) Encryption Details.

The committee also finished revision of the “Function” element, collapsing all sub-elements up into the main element, similar to “Date”

The next committee meeting is scheduled for August 24th in Room G31, Judicial Center. The group will start work on the “Date” and “Aggregation” elements.

Proposal for August 10, 2001 Metadata Meeting

Some important RM actions and metadata etc. needed to support them:

Action	Content	Classification	Date
Assign access rule(s) according to MN law	Statutory citation, <i>e.g.</i> M.S. 13.43; 626.556	Classification(s) from M.S. chapter 13	Date of action
Assign access rule(s) according to US law	Statutory or rule citation, <i>e.g.</i> 34 CFR 99.3	Classification(s) from M.S. chapter 13	Date of action
Assign MN Gov't Entity business access rule(s)	Read only; write only; write/read; access to application	Use schema by AAA/PKI group, or use Netegrity's "Site Minder" software	Date of action
Assign records retention schedule rule	Next action for record series <i>e.g.</i> to records center, to archives or dispose	Not applicable	Date action to occur
Mark / flag data "contested"	Notation that data within record have been challenged per MS 13.04	Not applicable	Date range. If no end date, contest is not resolved
Redact if necessary and grant access & save copy, or deny access	Use classification field plus identity of requestor to determine access	Not applicable	Date response to request prepared
Record request and response	Response, reasons, authority, requestor, other data	Classification(s) from M.S. chapter 13	Date of action
Mark records affected by law (MN or US) changes	Legislative Session Year and description of change	Previous code in question because law was changed	Effective date of law

The above chart does not document or take into account the fact that some data sharing may be authorized by federal or state law. We recommend that individual agencies track the data sharing on their own and that no metadata be created to address this issue. We are open to reconsidering this recommendation should someone be able to describe a business value that would warrant creating metadata and/or storing the data in a central location.

Some agencies, such as Revenue, have a need to track when data received from a federal source has been verified and becomes "state data." Revenue currently does this tracking at a data field level. We recommend creating a new sub-element to do this tracking at the record level because tracking it at a data field level is impractical as there would be a metadata sub-element entry for each field. The tracking would indicate that there is some data field that contains "federal data" and this would speed selection of records and cue the user to investigate further. The sub-element needs to be repeatable as different federal agencies have different rules about the use of federal data.

This scheme permits (1) automatic "contested" statement generation; (2) automatic redaction of data that requester is unable to access (if parts of records/documents are classified as other than public); and (3) automatic recording of action and what was provided.

We propose a central storage place to keep versions of state and federal statutes for each time period. The central repository will also contain a common scheme for coding certain data elements such as agency names, offices, data classifications, etc.

We recognize that there is an issue of how, or if it is even possible, to record classification by part or portion of a particular record or document. We did discuss how this might be done and are

willing to share that discussion in hopes that someone is able to offer a solution we did not consider.