

# Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee

**Agenda: 27 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) – *absent*  
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) – *absent*  
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) – *absent*  
Brian Zaidman (Department of Labor and Industry)

Committee Coordinator: Shawn Rounds (Minnesota State Archives)

1. Evaluate remaining Australian-designated mandatory elements: Management History, Disposal
2. Continue with other elements (e.g., Subject, Description, Language, etc.)
3. Set agenda for next meeting (November 3<sup>rd</sup>)

## 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 27 October 2000 meeting**

Next meeting will be on November 3rd. We will also meet on November 17<sup>th</sup> – same time, but at the Minnesota History Center (Crosby Room, Level B).

Lorraine asked whether someone at the Department of Administration or the Office of Technology keeps track of the metadata schemes being used in agencies. The general feeling was that this is not being done. Katie suggested she talk to Eileen McCormack to find out for certain.

Continued working through elements (see attached).

Note that Appendices 1 and 2 of the standard show relationships between elements. Useful for determining, for instance, where Record ID might be used/linked.

## Evaluation of “Management History” element

15.2 value list will need to be changed to reflect Minnesota terminology – controlled vocabulary but still agency-extensible.

Will need to determine format for 15.3 – free text or template -- controlled vocabulary, thesaurus.

Will need to carefully go through all terms and definitions and make sure that they correspond to generally accepted understanding in Minnesota. For instance, “copies” in standard do to necessarily mean “duplicates” as we might interpret it (see Use History, p. 98).

Note the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) only applies to federal agencies. Access to Minnesota state-owned data is governed by the MGDPA.

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, with extensions.**

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 and MN GIS schemes do not.**

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. Portions can be automatically captured; others would need to be manually input.**

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

**15.1: Mandatory**

**15.2: Mandatory**

**15.3: Mandatory**

## Evaluation of “Disposal” element

\*\* Standard developers will need to work closely with the Department of Administration, Information Policy Analysis Division and the State Archives to modify this element correctly.

Will need modifications to fit with Minnesota records retention practices and agency retention schedules – will need to be flexible and extensible.

Will need to specify values under 19.2 (Sentence) from standard state records retention form (e.g., Destroy, Transfer to State Archives, Permanent, Other). Would include retention period. Give examples like: “Destroy after 10 years”

Need to rename 19.2 from “Sentence” to “Retention Period”

Need to rename 19.3 from “Disposal Action Due” to “Disposal Due Date”

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, with extensions.**

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, MN GIS schemes do not.**

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. Portions can be automatically captured.**

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

**19.1: Mandatory**

**19.2: Mandatory**

**19.3: To be determined – mandatory?**

**19.4: Optional**

## Evaluation of “Use History” element

Will need to carefully analyze terms and definitions (like “copies”) to make sure they correspond to generally accepted understanding in Minnesota.

This will be used when agencies determine that records and access to those records are “significant.” Agencies will each have to define “significant”. Give some examples of what might significant (e.g., downloading personnel records).

Agencies will have to weigh benefits of keeping this information (e.g., accountability, for audits, for educational purposes, etc.) against the risks (e.g., possible evidence in legal action, etc.)

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

**Only to some agencies or parts of agencies.**

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?

**Maybe.**

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, although could be difficult.**

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 and MN GIS schemes do not.**

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

**Parts may be automatically captured**

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

**Element “Use History” should be optional, but if chosen, the sub-elements (16.1, 16.2, 16.3) are all mandatory.**

## Evaluation of “Preservation History” element

Probably a useful tool for any records management program, but some agencies may not have the resources to use it or may not have the need (for instance, records with relatively short retention periods).

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

**Yes, but not all may have the resources or need.**

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

**Yes, in terms of ensuring accessibility over time.**

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

**Yes, in terms of ensuring accessibility over time.**

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 and MN GIS schemes do not.**

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

**Some parts may be automatically captured.**

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

**The element “Preservation History” should be optional, but if chosen certain sub-elements (17.1, 17.2, 17.3) are mandatory.**

## Evaluation of “Mandate” element

All agencies governed by certain Minnesota laws -- Minnesota Statutes: MS15.10, MS15.17, MS138.17, MS138.163, MS Chapter 13 (MGDPA), MS Chapter 371 (Uniform Electronic Transactions Act). Minnesota Rules: MR1205. As well as records retention schedules, industry-specific regulations (like HIPPA), etc.

Only place in standard where we can point to specific mandate references.

For documentation of actions, for education purposes.

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

**Yes (Minnesota laws, records retention schedules, agreements for data sharing, industry-specific regulations, etc.)**

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 and MN GIS schemes do not.**

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. These could be automatically captured at series level and inherited by lower levels of records.**

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

**The element “Mandate” should be mandatory, with level of application (series or records) determined within each agency.**

**20.1: Mandatory**

**20.2: Mandatory**

**20.3: Mandatory**

**20.4: Mandatory**

**20.5: Mandatory**

# 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