

Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee

Agenda: 23 March 2001

9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., Room G31, Judicial Center (25 Constitution Ave.)

Committee Members:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)
Karen Bondy (Department of Children, Families and Learning)
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)

1. Introductions
2. Review structure and content of Australian standard
 - Introduction
 - Glossary
 - Metadata elements
 - Appendices

Need to consider such items as:

- How will the structure need to be changed?
- What terms and definitions will need to be changed? Added?
- How will each element need to be changed?
- Notes from Study Committee

1. Set agenda for April 6th 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>

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
23 March 2001

Committee Members Present:

Rudi Anders (Supreme Court)
Karen Bondy (Department of Children, Families and Learning)
Jim Harris (Department of Transportation)
Vicki Henning (InterTech)
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)

Others Present:

Jay Achenbach (Office of Technology)
Patricia Dunlop (Department of Transportation)
Ed Potter (Department of Health)
Carol Silvers (Idaho State Library)
Bruce Yurich (Department of Employee Relations)

Summary Minutes

Members and visitors introduced themselves.

Shawn Rounds passed around a list of items (attached) that will need to be considered as the group moves ahead with its work. She also provided summaries of the Dublin Core element set and the Minnesota GIS metadata set. Discussion of each of the items followed.

With respect to the Dublin Core, Eileen Quam informed the group that the Foundations project produced a best-practices manual for tagging web pages with metadata and that it might be a useful resource. The guidelines are online at: <http://bridges.state.mn.us/bestprac/index.html>

The Australian recordkeeping metadata standard is based on the Dublin Core. Other metadata schemes that the group may want to consider include MARC, ISO 11179 (metadata repository

standard being used right now by DNR), the Common Warehouse Metamodel (for data warehouses), GILS (Ohio model). Group will continue to compile a list of schemes as the work moves forward.

Discussion of diagram on page 15 of the Australian standard – how records receive associated metadata and are incorporated into recordkeeping system. Question – what about records that don't need to be in the system right away? Maybe could have just the basic set of metadata in anticipation of future needs? In some cases, it will be more appropriate for metadata to be applied at the record series level rather than to lower levels of records. For instance, record series is made up of individual records which themselves might be made up of individual documents (e.g., personnel file). The file is considered one item for retention purposes.

Question: what is the record population that we are trying to get a handle on? May be out-of-scope for this group – trying to develop a metadata scheme that could apply to any record. Perhaps just to get an understanding of some of the types of records that it will commonly apply to, could look at records retention schedules as a starting point. Minnesota records laws define what constitutes a “record” (for instance, does not include convenience copies or library materials). This could all be covered in the introductory material to the standard – what it can be applied to, how a record is defined by Minnesota law, examples, etc. Agency data compliance officers and records managers have the responsibility to manage records in accordance with laws. Will need to work with the Department of Administration's Information Policy Analysis Division (IPAD) on this issue. As a starting point for this group, Jim Mack will provide copies of the General Records Retention Schedule (not available in electronic form).

Minnesota scheme must be flexible and extensible enough to accommodate agency needs, but kept at a high level to meet broad, common, cross-agency requirements.

Agencies always have to balance costs – this group will need to consider how to do cost-benefit analysis. If scheme is a mandatory standard, will also need to consider the time requirement for agencies to get up to speed (concern really will be dealt with at IPC, OT level).

Committee members should start laying the groundwork for the eventual adoption of the standard by talking to people in their agencies (with help of records managers) – what is a record (by law and by agency policies), how are records handled, where are records stored, importance of records inventories and schedules, etc. Jim Mack/IPAD can assist with this process.

There is talk that Microsoft's new Office XP suite will incorporate some records management/workflow functions. Is there a standard that's being used? Maybe DoD 5015.12? Don't want to produce something that's at complete odds with Microsoft.

* Jim Harris, Jay Achenbach, and Karen Bondy will form a work group to look into this issue and report back. Others interested in helping should talk to Jim.

Jim Harris and Jay Achenbach are working on a proposed metadata and data interchange system using XML (model available online at committee web site: <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/metadev.html>). They would be happy to work with others on this project. The National Archives of Australia is planning to start work soon on an XML schema for their standard; the Victorian government (Australia) is already working on a DTD.

* Jim Harris and Jay Achenbach will form a work group to explore XML implementation of the metadata standard. Others interested in helping should talk to Jim.

Shawn Rounds passed around copies of the rough drafts of the Fitness for Use/Quality element that was proposed by the Study Committee. Groups members should read these over before starting to go through the Australian standard. Is there some way the idea of “fitness for use” or “quality” can be handled by an existing element?

For April 6th meeting –

- Jim Mack will provide copies of the General Records Retention Schedule.
- All committee members will prepare for work on Agent and Title elements.
- Shawn Rounds will draft a work plan.
- Shawn Rounds and Jim Harris will draft an outline for the standard based upon the conceptual template already established by the Office of Technology. Will put Australian standard into Word format for now (for easy manipulation) with the understanding that the Minnesota standard will be only distributed online (but not in PDF – not ADA-compliant).

From Eileen McCormack: These are the elements that have been part of OT-issued standards. Naturally during the development of a standard, most of the effort goes into the actual standard requirements, but the committee will want to make sure that the standard include these items as well.

Title

Issue Date

Effective Date

Applicability (Who cares about this standard? When does it apply?)

Audience (general, technical, executive, etc.)

Purpose of Standard

Standard Requirements: (what must agencies do)

Compliance: What constitutes compliance? How will compliance be measured?

References: Source of Standard, Source of more information

Public Policy: (Example: Minnesota Statutes Chapter 13 (Minnesota Government Data Practices Act); Chapter 15.17 (Official Records Act); Chapter 138.17 (Government Records Act))

Recordkeeping Metadata Development Committee

23 March 2001

Items to consider (in no particular order):

- a. How will the structure of the Australian standard need to be changed?
- b. What terms and definitions will need to be changed? Added? Deleted?
- c. How will each individual element need to be changed?
 - i. Refer to Study Committee notes as a start
 - ii. What values, schemes, laws, policies, etc. should be referenced?
 - iii. Mandatory or optional?
 - more
- a. How do the individual elements and the scheme as a whole fit in with existing metadata schemes (e.g., Minnesota GIS, Dublin Core)?
- b. Issue of flexibility (e.g., can meet needs of all government entities within reason)
- c. Issue of extensibility (i.e., agencies can extend it to meet specific needs)
- d. Integration with commercial software packages (and fit with DoD Standard 5015.12)
- e. Cost-benefit analysis
- f. Education and training issues
- g. Issues with ongoing maintenance (within and across agencies)
- h. Overall coordination of implementation and use
- i. Are there any broad needs that can't be met with the present set of metadata elements?
 - i. Fitness for Use / Quality element necessary?

* What's the best way to actually tackle making changes and addressing issues? Break into work groups? Other?