

## Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee

**Agenda: 20 April 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)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

- \* Introductions
- \* Element discussion
  - a. Title
  - b. Agent
- \* Set agenda for May 4<sup>th</sup> 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**

**20 April 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 Haagenson (City of Minneapolis; Minneapolis Community Development Agency)

Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)

Vicki Henning (InterTech)

Jim Mack (Department of Administration)

Eileen Quam (Department of Natural Resources)

Steve Retzlaff (Department of Public Safety)

Ken Nelson for Bruce Showel (Department of Revenue)

Lorraine Swick (Department of Children, Families and Learning)

John Wiersma (Department of Economic Security)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

### Others Present:

Jay Achenbach (Office of Technology)

Jennifer Johnson (State Archives)

Ed Potter (Department of Health)

Janice Zarkin (Department of Health)

### Summary Minutes

Members and visitors introduced themselves.

Shawn Rounds re-capped the last committee meeting. Committee now has three sub-groups tackling issues: cost/benefit issues (Bruce Showel, Linda Feist); XML implementation (Jim Harris, Jay Achenbach); integration with Microsoft Office Suite products (Jim Harris, Jay Achenbach, Karen Bondy).

Jim Harris reported on a Microsoft informational meeting for government staff that was held at the RiverCentre. Session covered the new Sharepoint product (formerly known as "Tahoe"). Customizable information portal and document management/workflow product. Will work with Office XP. Full demo version available from Microsoft site (caution: will overwrite current Office software). Doesn't seem to integrate very easily with XML. Document management component has no records management abilities beyond basic metadata from Office products and versioning. Another session will be held at the RiverCentre on May 16<sup>th</sup> (8:00-12:00) on the Office XP product. For more information on Sharepoint, visit Microsoft site.

Shawn passed around copies of a draft (see attached) that Bob Horton prepared on the distinction between records and collections of information (such as databases). Not meant to be a final draft, only a starting point for further discussion. Bob not at today's meeting. Question about how phone calls should be handled in the recordkeeping scheme – need to refer first to agency retention schedules because perhaps already addressed. Need to keep this recordkeeping metadata scheme at a general enough level so that it will apply to all record types, but could perhaps use phone calls as an example in the standard.

Eileen Quam and Linda Feist volunteered to serve as a sub-group to draft examples to accompany the standard. Please contact one of them if you are interested in helping.

-----

Group finished revising the Title element of Australian standard. Revised version will be posted in HTML on committee web site when available.

Concern was raised about exactly how the repeatability of elements works – may be an implementation issue.

Discussion about when an element has sub-elements and when they aren't needed. Group looked to standard for examples of each case.

-----

Group began revising Subject element. Revised version will be posted on committee web site when draft completed.

-----

Next meeting scheduled for May 4<sup>th</sup>. Will be held in Judicial Center, Room G31. Will complete Subject element and perhaps move on to Agent.

## Recordkeeping Metadata

19 April 2001

Bob Horton, Minnesota State Archives

“Record” is formally defined in Minnesota Statutes 138.17:

“Government records” means state and local records, including all cards, correspondence, discs, maps, memoranda, microfilms, papers, photographs, recordings, reports, tapes, writings, optical disks, and other data, information, or documentary material, regardless of physical form or characteristics, storage media or conditions of use, made or received 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.

The pertinent element is the clear connection to the ordinary activities and functions of an agency (“pursuant to state law” and “transaction of public business”). Agencies collect data and, in fact, can only collect data (see, e.g., M.S, 13.05, subd.3) in the course of legislatively authorized activities.

According to statute, then, a “record” is a legal or intellectual construct; it is data formatted as a manifestation or result of a function, activity, or transaction. Recordkeeping metadata is specifically designed to manage data as a “record,” so it primarily reflects statutory mandates.

Data also has a “physical” manifestation. It is created, stored, managed, etc. in a specific array of hardware, software, and operational decisions. One example is a database. “Record” has a specific meaning in database terminology, but it is not the same meaning as is state law. A relational database might very well contain data from many different government records, reflecting many different functions and transactions, but managing the database is going to be different from managing the government records it may contain, in whole or in part. As a consequence, managing a database demands some specific metadata, but it is a different kind of metadata than recordkeeping metadata. For convenience, we can call this “operational metadata.”

The two types of metadata should be connected because recordkeeping metadata will inform and determine operations. The laws and policies about records determine security and access needs, dictate disposition and preservation requirements, etc. Recordkeeping metadata will tell a data base administrator *what* to do with data; operational metadata will help a DBA to do it.

To make this system practical, recordkeeping metadata should be flexible, extensible and minimal. It should connect to other kinds of metadata; it should promote the development of useful metadata; and it should function as a standard across individual agencies, functions and applications.