

Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee

Agenda: 17 November 2000
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
Crosby Room, Minnesota History Center

Committee Members:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)
Karen Bondy (Department of Children, Families and Learning)
Gretchen Domian (Department of Revenue) – *absent*
Katie Engler (Department of Administration)
Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)
Bob Horton (Minnesota State Archives) – *absent*
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) – *absent*
Lorraine Swick (Department of Children, Families and Learning) – *absent*
John Wiersma (Department of Economic Security) – *absent*
Brian Zaidman (Department of Labor and Industry) – *absent*

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

1. Review conclusions from detailed study of standard (including proposed “Quality” element)
2. Work through proposed report outline (recommendations, next steps, etc.)
3. Set agenda for next meeting (December 1st)

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 17 November 2000 meeting

From Jim Harris – proposed element “Quality”

21. QUALITY

Definition A numerical measure, according to the Scheme specified, of the quality (reliability, accuracy, completeness, etc.) of the record.

Purpose To provide an indication of the record's trustworthiness or suitability, e.g. for inclusion in an analysis or other action to support a decision.

Obligation Optional

Applicability All levels of aggregation.

Use Conditions Values shall be assigned to the sub-elements at record entry, and may be modified according to agency policy but modifications must be recorded in 15. Management History. This element shall be linked to element 1. AGENT to enable the corporate entity / element or individual responsible for the quality value assignments to be recorded. This element shall also be linked to element 14. RECORD IDENTIFIER.

Repeatable? Yes, if in each repetition the Scheme is different.

Sub-elements

21.1 Quality Scheme – Mandatory – A reference to the Quality Measurement Scheme used to derive the rating in 21.1, Quality Measure. This is chosen from a controlled list that will be started with industry-standard schemes, but may be appended by any agency unilaterally, with unique scheme name to be agreed to by central authority.

21.2 Quality Measure – Mandatory – A number valid in the Quality Scheme chosen in 21.1.

21.3 Quality Units of Measure – Mandatory – A choice from a list of valid units of measure that is valid in the Scheme, 21.1, e.g. for a Location record, the circular (radius length) probability of error may be expressed in Inches, Feet, or Yards, or mm, cm, or m.

Comments

Notes Regarding “Quality”

Are there other ways to indicate this? Perhaps as a sub-element of another element?

Right now, with numerical measurement mandated, not widely applicable.

Seems very subjective. A record may not need to be complete, the most current, etc. to be useful to a user – best to let users evaluate appropriateness of data for themselves (may be fit for use in some cases). MN GIS metadata set has narrative qualifiers. Also, users often want everything to sort through themselves (esp. with data warehouses).

Can this element be used like a disclaimer?

* Re-title element “Fitness for Use”

Remove “numerical” from Definition

* 21.1: Fitness Scheme (may be free text)

* 21.2: Fitness Description

* 21.3: Intended Use (free text)

Jim will re-work this and re-distribute. **NOT IN FINAL FORM – ONLY SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE!**

General Comments on Element Set

Edit Criteria Item 8: the group took ease of capture into account when discussing whether or not element could be automatically captured.

What types of records is this element set applicable to? Includes:

- Spatial data
- Graphical data
- Sound, video, animation files (multimedia)
- Databases
- Data warehouses
- CAD drawings
- Forms
- E-mail
- Word processing documents
- Web pages

General Discussion Regarding IPC Report

IPC has issued “Proposed Process for Developing Policies, Standards, and Guidelines” available online at: <http://www.state.mn.us/intergov/ipc/resources/propmsg.html>

An IPC sub-committee is studying this process and will make its recommendations to the IPC early next year.

This study committee is completing Step One of the process. Proposing to the IPC that things move along to Step Two.

How about calling this a “guideline” instead of a “standard?” Might be easier to sell to agencies up front, standard suggests an unfunded mandate. But on the other hand, agencies may not be willing to implement a guideline if they don’t absolutely have to. Also, if our purpose is to help users, metadata should be mandatory. Perhaps guideline would move to standard at some point.

* One solution might be to tell the IPC about our awareness of the development process and that it is being examined, but say that we will leave it to the development group to determine whether this is more appropriate as a “guideline” or “standard.” Perhaps “model standard?” still gives structure without mandating use.

Should include representatives from local government (i.e., city, county) in development process somehow – often are partners with state government agencies, might want to adopt on their own.

Development group should be relatively small, limited number (like 15). Would need to actively communicate with interested parties (IPC, DIG-IT, MN GRIN, local governments, state agencies, etc.) – invite comment and input. Have open meetings like the IPC where non-committee members can come and observe and comment. Other groups for getting the word out: DAMA, ARMA, TIES, LOGIS, AMC, AIIM, League of Minnesota Cities.

Ask IPC/CIOs for nominations for development committee (core group). If there are too many for the available spots (reserve some for local), then come back in January as them to pare it down.

Need to draft charge and work plan for next group. Asking IPC to let us organize this and move ahead. Study committee to serve as advisory group. Bring in experts as appropriate. Get the word out through the annual IT symposium, web site, e-mail, etc.

Jake Manahan (IPC) suggested we get at least an executive summary to the IPC Executive Committee before their next meeting on December 6th. Get draft to whole IPC before meeting on December 21st. Question of who should present.