

Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee

Agenda: 20 October 2000

9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Room 1C, Department of Human Services (444 Lafayette Road)

Committee Members:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)
Karen Bondy (Department of Children, Families and Learning)
Gretchen Domian (Department of Revenue)
Katie Engler (Department of Administration)
Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)
Bob Horton (Minnesota State Archives) – *absent*
Robbie LaFleur (Legislative Reference Library) – *absent*
Jim Mack (Department of Administration)
Robert Maki (Department of Natural Resources) – *absent*
Karl Olmstead (Department of Transportation) – *absent*
Eileen Quam (Department of Natural Resources) – *absent*
Kate Severin (Department of Human Services)
Lorraine Swick (Department of Children, Families and Learning)
John Wiersma (Department of Economic Security)
Brian Zaidman (Department of Labor and Industry)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

1. Evaluate remaining Australian-designated mandatory elements: Date (started on October 6th), Rights Management, Title, Aggregation Level, Record Identifier, Management History, Disposal
2. Set agenda for next meeting (October 27th? November 3rd?)

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 20 October 2000 meeting

Jim Harris will send list of other metadata schemes he's researched to the group via e-mail.

Next meeting will be on October 27th.

Karen has been having trouble accessing minutes and agendas from web site. Site visitors should remember to re-load/refresh the pages each time new content is put up. Can be sent around as actual files if need be. Contact Shawn if problem persists.

Jim Harris and John Weirsma both brought up the need for some sort of reliability- or quality-related element. Jim will write something up and distribute it to the group for discussion and consideration.

Continued working through elements (see attached).

Evaluation of “Date” element

Should “Time” also be mandatory? Must be a business need. Not always available. Not generally tracked for non-electronic records. Need to have standard format and explicit statement that time references are for Minnesota time zone. Use system time – assume Minnesota-specific.

Date can be a range for a series, specific for an individual record.

Will need to specify (and provide examples) how to indicate date range (e.g., x “through” y; x “-“ y)

Will need to be able to indicate unknown day and/or month and/or year. Need to specify format.

1. Will [specific element] apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?
Yes.
2. Does [specific element] facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?
Yes.
3. Does [specific element] accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?
Yes, but not sufficient on its own.
4. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?
Yes.
5. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?
Yes, supports date range.
6. How applicable is [specific element] to non-electronic records?
Can be applicable, depending on level of detail.
7. 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?
Dublin Core uses date (ISO 8601), as does the DOT metadata standard (in development). MN GIS scheme also has date element.

Evaluation of “Date” element (continued)

8. How easy is it to capture [specific element]? Can it be automatically captured and, if so, how?

If an element is considered important enough in terms of business needs to be mandatory, ease of capture should not be a factor. Date is often automatically captured in electronic systems, but not always for records originating outside of system (e.g., in case of some transactions, see 10.2).

9. Should [specific element] be mandatory or optional?

10.1: Mandatory.

10.2: To be determined.

10.3: Mandatory

Different interpretations of meaning and necessity will need to be ironed out with respect to these sub-elements.

Evaluation of “Rights Management” element

Agencies will have different needs beyond the requirements of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act (federal regulations, HIPPA, etc.). This element would need to be robust enough to enable proper management with respect to MGDPA and flexible enough to accommodate other schemes.

Element will need to be repeatable.

Will need to determine how to deal with situation where one part of record is open and another is not.

Will somehow need to track and annotate changes to laws.

Will need to indicate whether record content is being contested.

Will need to be clear on the difference between “release” and “access”

Will need to somehow indicate necessity for high-level aggregation (so individuals can't be identified) when necessary. Under 2.6 (Usage Condition)?

Need an agreed-upon, central thesaurus

** To work out the details of this element, the standard's developers will need to work closely with the Department of Administration's Information Policy Analysis Division (Jim Mack, Katie Engler, Don Gemberling).

1. Will [specific element] apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?

Yes.

2. Does [specific element] facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?

Yes, and will accommodate other schemes as well with changes.

3. Does [specific element] accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?

Yes.

4. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?

Yes, enables lawful retrieval.

Evaluation of “Rights Management” element (continued)

5. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?

Yes, enables lawful retrieval.

6. How applicable is [specific element] to non-electronic records?

Yes.

7. 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?

Dublin Core has Rights Management element (for copyright information, etc.). MN GIS has Access Constraint and Use Constraint elements.

8. How easy is it to capture [specific element]? Can it be automatically captured and, if so, how?

If an element is considered important enough in terms of business needs to be mandatory, ease of capture should not be a factor. This will be potentially challenging in this case, but must be done.

9. Should [specific element] be mandatory or optional?

2.1: Mandatory.

2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7: determination of whether mandatory or optional will depend on how each is defined.

Evaluation of “Title” element

1. Will [specific element] apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?
Yes.
2. Does [specific element] facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?
Yes.
3. Does [specific element] accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?
Yes.
4. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?
Yes.
5. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?
Yes.
6. How applicable is [specific element] to non-electronic records?
Yes.
7. 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?
Dublin Core uses Title elements, as does the MN GIS scheme.
8. How easy is it to capture [specific element]? Can it be automatically captured and, if so, how?
If an element is considered important enough in terms of business needs to be mandatory, ease of capture should not be a factor.
9. Should [specific element] be mandatory or optional?
 - 3.1: Mandatory.**
 - 3.2: Mandatory.**
 - 3.3: Mandatory.**
 - 3.4: Optional.**

Evaluation of “Aggregation” element

Values will need to be re-defined.

1. Will [specific element] apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?

Yes.

2. Does [specific element] facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?

Yes.

3. Does [specific element] accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?

Yes.

4. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?

Yes.

5. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?

Yes.

6. How applicable is [specific element] to non-electronic records?

Yes.

7. 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?

Dublin Core does not have a similar element.

8. How easy is it to capture [specific element]? Can it be automatically captured and, if so, how?

If an element is considered important enough in terms of business needs to be mandatory, ease of capture should not be a factor. Perhaps not captured automatically – may need to manually entered.

9. Should [specific element] be mandatory or optional?

Mandatory.

Evaluation of “Record Identifier” element

Will need to work out how unique, cross-system and cross-agency identifiers should be coordinated and assigned – Central clearinghouse? Standard naming scheme (i.e., agency prefix plus number)? Problem with non-agency organizations (like various boards). What does the Department of Finance use for agency identifier?

Implementation issue – someone in each agency (records manager?) will need to oversee the ID assignment process.

“Assigned by” should list system (system ID and version indication, etc.) if automatically done.

1. Will [specific element] apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?

Yes.

2. Does [specific element] facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?

Yes.

3. Does [specific element] accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?

Yes.

4. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?

Yes.

5. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?

Yes.

6. How applicable is [specific element] to non-electronic records?

Yes, mandatory within recordkeeping system.

7. 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?

Dublin Core has Identifier element. MN GIS has MN Clearinghouse ID.

8. How easy is it to capture [specific element]? Can it be automatically captured and, if so, how?

If an element is considered important enough in terms of business needs to be mandatory, ease of capture should not be a factor. Should be fairly easy to capture for electronic records, perhaps not as easy with respect to non-electronic.

9. Should [specific element] be mandatory or optional?

Mandatory for electronic within recordkeeping system.

Criteria for Evaluating Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard

6 October 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 using a wide array of software (i.e., document management, e-mail, databases, web, etc.)?

Element Level:

1. Will [specific element] apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?
2. Does [specific element] facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?
3. Does [specific element] accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?
4. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?
5. Does [specific element] enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?
6. How applicable is [specific element] to non-electronic records?
7. 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?
8. How easy is it to capture [specific element]? Can it be automatically captured and, if so, how?
9. Should [specific element] be mandatory or optional?

Other items to consider:

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