

Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee

Agenda: 18 May 2001

9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., Court of Appeals Dining Room, Judicial Center

Committee Members:

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)
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
- Re-cap of last meeting and updates from work groups
- Element discussion
 - a. Agent
 - b. Rights Management
- Set agenda for June 1st 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

4 May 2001

Committee Members Present:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)
Karen Bondy (Department of Children, Families and Learning)
Patricia Dunlop (Department of Transportation)
Linda Feist (Office of the Governor)
Marsha Haagenon (City of Minneapolis; Minneapolis Community Development Agency)
Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)
Vicki Henning (InterTech)
Jim Mack (Department of Administration)
Eileen McCormack (*ex officio*, Office of Technology)
Eileen Quam (Department of Natural Resources)
Bruce Showel (Department of Revenue)
Craig Steiner (City of Minneapolis)
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)

Others Present:

Jay Achenbach (Office of Technology)
Jennifer Johnson (State Archives)
Dennis Lennartson (Department of Public Safety, for Steve Retzlaff)

Summary Minutes

Shawn Rounds gave a summary of a FileNet electronic document management system demo that was sponsored by the Office of Technology on May 17th. The FileNet suite consists of several components, including ones to handle content management, workflow management, and web publishing. It has a records management component, as well, that's compliant with the DoD 5015.2 standard. Records management capabilities include the ability to assign retention periods, set access restrictions, do online backups, and maintain version control. Files are preserved in their native formats and are accessed through a reader. Associated metadata is stored in a SQL or Oracle database. Metadata elements are customizable and the system allows for user-defined controlled vocabularies. The suite can also handle compound documents as well as single documents by keeping track of links and relationships with a parent-child system. External documents (i.e., paper, microforms) can also be tracked by the metadata repository. The suite allows for content-based and metadata-based searching through customizable, savable, and

sharable search templates. Right now XML is only used in the workflow component, but FileNet is working to incorporate it in other areas as well. Shawn will contact Gary Ehrreich (FileNet Senior Account Executive, gehreich@filenet.com) to follow up with some metadata-related questions.

Bruce Showel and Linda Feist reported on a cost-benefit analysis worksheet they've drafted. They recommend that the only way to practically approach the problem is on an individual government entity basis since each knows best the value of its particular records, its own retention schedules, etc. The work sheet is divided into four parts: benefits, factors to consider in determining benefits, costs associated with specific document and/or metadata elements, and factors to consider in determining costs. The worksheet draft is simply a starting point and they asked the group for input. The group offered some suggestions which Bruce will incorporate into the next draft. Eileen Quam pointed out that when she did something similar for web metadata (Bridges project, DNR), she found that the costs were concrete, but the benefits were much more abstract. It was suggested that including examples may help agencies work through the analysis. Jim Harris mentioned that Mn/DOT did a similar analysis (benefit and cost factors) for the implementation of his metadata interchange scheme; he suggested that the committee's list might be expanded or checked through some Internet research into similar projects. Eileen McCormack and Jay Achenbach will check at OT to see what sorts of analysis methodologies have been used in the past for IT-related efforts.

Linda Feist spoke about the need to go beyond the cost analysis to marketing the standard to high-level policy and decision makers. The need to educate and to convince of the value requires an ongoing effort. Shawn will try to get on the IPC's June agenda to give that group an update on the committee's progress; she'll work with Linda to develop a "sales" strategy.

Karen Bondy suggested that perhaps the committee should address job qualifications in the guideline for people involved in recordkeeping metadata work in agencies. Others added that the discussion could include recommendations for desirable skills, reference areas, etc. rather than specifications for a particular position.

Eileen McCormack raised the issue of whether the group should consider the funding needs that will accompany actual, physical implementation of the standard. Is probably beyond this group's charge, but can make recommendations to the IPC.

Jim Harris reported that Mn/DOT estimates that it will cost about \$40,000 to initially implement the metadata interchange architecture in that agency, will an additional \$4,000 per year in maintenance costs. Jim discussed the value of offering the standard in machine readable and human-readable form using XML to deliver the information via the Web.

The group began revision of the "Agent" element.

Is “Agent” a good title for this element? Confusing and unclear?

The idea of using “Use History” to audit the value of records in terms of number of times used would require a distinction between users and those who perform administrative tasks relating to the record. Perhaps replace “Action Officer” with “User”?

Some agencies need to track who accesses a record (legal requirement, audit purposes, etc.) and that seems to go beyond the present Agent Type value list.

Will need definitions for “Management” (to include retention and disposal related actions) and “Disposal” (term used on Minnesota records retention form to mean destruction, transfer to State Archives, permanent, or other).

On further discussion, the committee may not follow the study group’s recommendations as to mandatory/optional sub-elements, in light of the need to track users (who may be anonymous)

The next committee meeting is scheduled for June 1st in Room G31, Judicial Center. The group will continue revising the “Agent” element.