

## Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee

**Agenda: 15 September 2000**

9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., Department of Human Services

Committee Members:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court) – *Absent*  
Karen Bondy (Department of Children, Families and Learning) – *1<sup>st</sup> meeting*  
Gretchen Domian (Department of Revenue) – *1<sup>st</sup> meeting*  
Katie Engler (Department of Administration)  
Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)  
Bob Horton (Minnesota State Archives)  
Jim Mack (Department of Administration)  
Robert Maki (Department of Natural Resources)  
Karl Olmstead (Department of Transportation)  
Eileen Quam (Department of Natural Resources) – *Absent*  
Kate Severin (Department of Human Services)  
Lorraine Swick (Department of Children, Families and Learning) – *Absent*  
John Wiersma (Department of Economic Security)  
Brian Zaidman (Department of Labor and Industry)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

1. Definitions (e.g., record, recordkeeping, retention schedules, metadata (including level of application), etc.)
2. Points of view
3. Legal requirements
4. Criteria for evaluation of standard
5. Set agenda for October 6<sup>th</sup> meeting

### 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 15 September 2000 meeting

The group discussed terminology and decided upon some definitions.

“Record”: Minnesota Statute 138.17, subd. 1

"All cards, correspondence, discs, maps, memoranda, microfilms, papers, photographs, recordings, reports, tapes, writings and other data, information or documentary material, regardless of physical form or characteristics, storage media or conditions of use, made or by an officer or agency of the state and an officer or agency of a county, city, town, school district, municipal subdivision or corporation or other public authority or political entity within the state pursuant to state law or in connection with the transaction of public business by an officer or agency."

“Recordkeeping”

Documentation that allows for accountability and the ability to meet mandates and other needs (legal, fiscal, historical, etc.). What is necessary to “make and preserve all records necessary to a full and accurate knowledge of . . . official activities.” (Minnesota Statute 15.17, subd. 1)

“Retention Schedule”: *Preserving and Disposing of Government Records*, p. 6

“A plan for the management of your records. It lists your entity’s records and how they should be kept. The purpose of a retention schedule is to provide continuing authority to dispose of or transfer records to the State Archives.”

The *Preserving and Disposing of Government Records* booklet was published by the Information Policy Analysis Division of the Department of Administration in July 2000. It outlines records management policies and activities for Minnesota government agencies. It is available online in PDF format at:

<http://www.admin.state.mn.us/ipo/pipa/pipa.html>

Agencies currently have latitude in determining the value of their records with respect to the above definitions and have the responsibility for setting retention schedules and then following through. Any recordkeeping metadata standard should facilitate that recordkeeping process. Recordkeeping metadata is one component in the recordkeeping process.

Metadata needs to be applied at the time of record creation – better chance of correct metadata. Application of metadata should be automatic.

Record should be “managed” from the time of their creation according to records retention schedules.

Recordkeeping metadata set would allow agencies to prioritize records series using to retention schedules as a first step in focusing resources for discovery and retrieval.

Implementation of recordkeeping metadata standard (and associated issues) is not within the scope of this group, although we can make recommendations. This group is just deciding whether the Australian standard is suitable in some form for use in Minnesota – will it meet our needs? Will this standard help us meet our mandates better? Does this standard fit our business needs and goals? Just providing one focused piece of infrastructure here – a cross-agency mechanism for discovery, retrieval, and management.

The Australian recordkeeping metadata set can be applied at the record series level, the file level, or the item level. Would be up to agencies to determine at what level to capture metadata – flexibility and extensibility are two of the standard's features.

Would need an educational component along with standard.

Not everything captured on computer – need to account for other items as well. Metadata capture in any medium needs to be embedded in the methodology of record creation.

E-mail is a huge problem. Perhaps just evaluate this standard in light of more systematic record series and tackle e-mail later. Need to stop thinking of how information is communicated and think about the content instead.

Can there be a central point to verify agency implementations? Central keyword list like with Foundations project? Perhaps a central repository or clearinghouse for agency glossaries, etc.? Implementation issue for later.

Need for funding, coordination, education, documentation, and maintenance all are implementation issues.

-----

Group developed first list of criteria for evaluating standard and individual elements (List appended) from preceding discussion and business case (developed at last meeting, appended).

# Criteria for Evaluating Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard

## 15 September 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 by a wide array of software (i.e., document management, e-mail, databases, web, etc.)?

### Element Level:

- Will [specific element] apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?
- Does [specific element] facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?
- Does [specific element] accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?
- Can [specific element] be tracked down to the item level for easy and fast retrieval?
- Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level?
- How applicable is [specific element] to non-electronic records?
- 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?
- How easy is it to capture [specific element]?

Other items to consider:

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

For consideration beyond this group:

- which elements are mandatory or optional?

# **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