

# Final Report of the Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee to the Information Policy Council

December 2000

- I. Executive Summary
- II. Minnesota Government Context
- III. Details of the Minnesota Study
- IV. Background to the Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard
- V. Findings and Recommendations
- VI. Recommended Next Steps: Development of Minnesota Recordkeeping Metadata Guideline
- VII. Bibliography
- VIII. Appendices
  - A. Original Proposal to IPC
  - B. Business Case for Metadata and Recordkeeping Metadata Guidelines
  - C. Evaluation Criteria Applied to Australian Standard
  - D. Results of Element-Level Study
  - E. Glossary

Report available online at: <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/metarkms.html>

## I. Executive Summary

The Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee was:

- formed in August 2000 with the approval of the Information Policy Council (IPC), and
- charged with studying the feasibility of adapting the National Archives of Australia's recordkeeping metadata standard for use by Minnesota state agencies and making recommendations to the IPC.

A Minnesota-specific recordkeeping metadata standard would, among other benefits,

- build on the practical framework provided by the Trustworthy Information Systems Handbook (produced by the State Archives) and the Foundations web metadata tagging project (supported by the Department of Natural Resources);
- provide a sound basis for improved agency record and data management, particularly with respect to compliance with all appropriate statutes, including the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act; and
- facilitate the location and retrieval of records for agency and public use.

After a detailed examination of the Australian recordkeeping metadata standard, the committee makes the following recommendations to the IPC:

1. The Australian standard should be the model for a similar guideline or standard for Minnesota government agencies.
2. Some metadata elements should be mandatory (Agent, Rights Management, Title, Subject, Function, Date, Aggregation Level, Record Identifier, Management History, Location, Disposal, and Mandate); other elements would be optional (Description, Language, Relation, Coverage, Type, Format, Use History, Preservation History, Fitness for Use).
3. A development team should be formed to undertake the task of adapting the standard for use here.

A complete copy of this report is available online at:  
<http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/metarkms.html>

## II. Minnesota Context

A wide variety of projects and resources have underscored the importance of metadata in the past few years. In Minnesota, a number of government agencies have looked closely at metadata-related issues, concepts, and applications for locating, using, and managing data and records.

The most substantively realized application of metadata comes from the Geographic Information System (GIS) community. In this arena, two state agencies, the Land Management Information Center (LMIC) and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), have played major roles. Their work in setting standards, developing educational curricula, and building applications for GIS metadata has set an example for the rest of government. The Minnesota Geographic Data Clearinghouse and the Data Deli are products that showcase how metadata can foster the exchange and re-use of information.<sup>1</sup>

Recordkeeping metadata is information that facilitates both management of, and access to, records. While the optimum metadata for any particular record set may vary, such information often includes items like the name of the record creator, date and time of creation, record identifier, key words, location, and description. It can also give reference to applicable policies and laws like the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act. Without adequate metadata, a number of records management problems can arise, particularly with respect to electronic records. To list a few examples, it may be difficult to: locate records, pinpoint the official record when multiple copies exist, determine whether a record has been modified since its creation, determine who should have access to a record, and carry out the proper disposition of a record (e.g., archive, destroy) at the end of its retention period.<sup>2</sup>

Two efforts have already yielded practical records management and metadata tools which would complement a formal recordkeeping metadata scheme. The *Trustworthy Information Systems Handbook* was developed by the State Archives and issued in January 2000.<sup>3</sup> The *Handbook* provides agencies with a methodology and tool set for establishing the authenticity and reliability of their records. The Foundations Project, which was coordinated by the DNR and completed in July 2000, established a set of best practices for web page metadata tagging with an accompanying commercial software tool.<sup>4</sup> Another deliverable from this project is the Ultraseek search engine used on the North Star web site, which is optimized to give higher rankings to web pages with Dublin Core metadata tags.

The Information Policy Council (IPC), the Data Issues Group for Information Technology (DIG-IT), and the Office of Technology (OT) have compellingly established the need for metadata through several studies. The information architecture workshops presented by the META Group demonstrate that metadata standards will be a basic, fundamental component of any statewide

---

<sup>1</sup> The Clearinghouse is available online at: <http://www.lmic.state.mn.us/chouse/index.html>; the Data Deli is available online at: <http://deli.dnr.state.mn.us/>

<sup>2</sup> Refer to Appendix B for the committee's business case for recordkeeping metadata.

<sup>3</sup> The *Handbook* and associated tools are available online at: <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/tis/tis.html>

<sup>4</sup> More information on the Foundations Project and its products is available online at: <http://bridges.state.mn.us/>

architecture. The work of the Data Summit, sponsored by the IPC and DIG-IT, called for metadata standards as primary elements.<sup>5</sup>

Finally, the need for metadata standards is evident from the most recent developments in legal policies and mandates governing the adoption of information technology. Minnesota has passed Uniform Electronic Transactions Act (UETA)<sup>6</sup>, and it is covered by the federal Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (E-Sign). Both make the deployment of electronic government services contingent on the description of systems and records sufficient to meet the demands of the rules of evidence. This has been confirmed in the work of the Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force, which has studied especially how E-Sign determines the way government can formulate standards for the submission of records in an electronic format.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> This work is summarized in a Meta Group report entitled “Metadata Strategy: Minnesota State Archives,” available online at: <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/metadastudies.html>

<sup>6</sup> Minnesota Statutes, chapter 325L is available online at: [www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/stats/325L/](http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/stats/325L/)

<sup>7</sup> Information on UETA and E-Sign can be found at: <http://www.uetaonline.com/>

### III. Details of Minnesota Study

The Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee was formed in August 2000 with the approval of the IPC (refer to Appendix A for proposal) at the suggestion of the Data Issues Group for Information Technology (DIG-IT), the Minnesota Government Records and Information Network (MN GRIN), and the State Archives. The goal of the committee was to “study the feasibility of adapting the National Archives of Australia’s recordkeeping metadata standard for use by Minnesota state agencies.”

The IPC requested that committee members be nominated by state agency CIOs. Although the original proposal asked for a nine-person committee, it soon became apparent that there was widespread interest in participation and that wider representation would facilitate the study. Fifteen people served on the committee, representing several agencies and areas of expertise (e.g., records management, data administration, data warehousing, law, GIS, libraries, web pages). They are:

- Rudi Anders (Supreme Court; DIG-IT; MN GRIN)
- Karen Bondy (Department of Children, Families and Learning)
- Gretchen Domian (Department of Revenue; MN GRIN )
- Katie Engler (Department of Administration)
- Jim Harris (Department of Transportation; DIG-IT; MN GRIN)
- Bob Horton (State Archivist, State Archives)
- Jim Mack (State Records Coordinator, Department of Administration; DIG-IT; MN GRIN)
- Robert Maki (Department of Natural Resources)
- Karl Olmstead (Department of Transportation)
- Eileen Quam (Department of Natural Resources)
- Shawn Rounds (State Archives, DIG-IT; MN GRIN) – Committee Coordinator
- Kate Severin (Department of Human Services; DIG-IT; MN GRIN)
- Lorraine Swick (Department of Children, Families and Learning)
- John Wiersma (Department of Economic Security)
- Brian Zaidman (Department of Labor and Industry; DIG-IT)

The committee met eight times from September through December<sup>8</sup>. As a first step, the committee brainstormed a business case for metadata in general and for recordkeeping metadata in particular (refer to Appendix B). From the components of the business case, the group then developed a set of evaluation criteria as a tool to help examine each of the elements of the Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard (refer to Appendix C).

The committee studied each of the elements, one by one, at a relatively high level. For each, the group noted, among other things, whether or not the element is appropriate for Minnesota government use, which sub-elements and components might need revision or deletion, and which portions should be mandatory (refer to Appendix D).

---

<sup>8</sup> Agendas and minutes are available online at: <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/metarkms.html>

## IV. Background to Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard

The *Recordkeeping Metadata Standard for Commonwealth Agencies* (hereafter referred to as the RKMS) was issued in May 1999 (Version 1, current version) by the National Archives of Australia.<sup>9</sup> The goal of the RKMS is to “help agencies to identify, authenticate, describe, and manage their electronic records in a systematic and consistent way to meet business, accountability, and archival requirements.” The authors note that “while the standard is designed primarily for electronic recordkeeping systems, many of its concepts are also applicable to traditional paper-based or hybrid recordkeeping environments. It should be regarded as a basic foundation which agencies can build upon in order to satisfy any additional specialized recordkeeping requirements they may have.”

The RKMS supplements the *Australian Standard on Records Management (AS 4390)* and the *Designing and Implementing Recordkeeping Systems (DIRKS) Manual*, and is designed to mesh with the Australian Government Information Locator Service (AGLS). Because of its linkage with AGLS, the RKMS is based in part on the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set, which has seen wide adoption and is currently under consideration as an ANSI/NISO standard for resource discovery (Draft Standard Z39.85-200X).<sup>10</sup>

The National Archives of Australia actively promotes the RKMS in training courses since it is an integral part of its recommended recordkeeping scheme. However, use of the RKMS is not presently mandated by the Australian government and there is no formal mechanism for the National Archives to receive feedback on implementation. Despite the lack of usage information from the agency level, the Archives reports that the State Government of Victoria has adopted the RKMS and the State Government of New South Wales is using it as the basis for the development of its own recordkeeping metadata standard.

On the international side, the RKMS is receiving much positive attention as a valuable resource and model. The ISO (International Organization for Standardization) TC46/SC11 sub-committee plans on developing a metadata standard to complement ISO 15489, a draft recordkeeping standard that is based upon AS 4390. Committee member Michael Steemson is confident that the Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard “will undoubtedly be an important founding document” for such work.<sup>11</sup>

As for use of the RKMS in Minnesota, the National Archives of Australia is “very happy for other archival institutions or recordkeeping programs to copy or adapt the standard for their own purposes.”<sup>12</sup> The National Archives’ Publications Manager has granted to Minnesota state government groups explicit written permission to use. Any form of use, including adaptation, must include acknowledgement of the National Archives of Australia as the source (including

---

<sup>9</sup> The standard is available online at: <http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/control/summary.html>

<sup>10</sup> ANSI (American National Standards Institute); NISO (National Information Standards Organization). The draft standard is available online at: <http://www.niso.org/Z3985.html>

<sup>11</sup> Michael Steemson to Shawn Rounds, 9 October 2000 (e-mail).

<sup>12</sup> Adrian Cunningham to Shawn Rounds, 14 July 2000 (e-mail).

full name, full title of source publication, and website address of publication).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Alexandra Bellis to Shawn Rounds, 3 October 2000 (e-mail).

## V. Findings and Recommendations

The Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee has concluded that the Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard should be adapted for use in Minnesota with some alterations. Although the committee would like to see it eventually adopted as a standard rather than a guideline, the development team and the IPC are the most appropriate groups to make the final decision. For purposes of discussion in this report, it will be referred to as a “guideline.”

Implementation of a recordkeeping metadata guideline would provide several valuable benefits:

- improve records management of all record types and media;
- facilitate compliance with the requirements of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act and other laws;
- facilitate data sharing within and between agencies where allowed by law; and
- facilitate location and retrieval of records for use within agencies and by citizens.

The RKMS consists of twenty metadata elements (with sub-elements), which may be applied to individual records or used at the records series level. Each element is linked to the record or series it describes. Many of the elements can be captured automatically by information systems (the ideal situation) as records are created or used, although some information may need to be entered manually. Agencies would have the option to extend the metadata set as necessary with additional elements to meet agency-specific needs.

The recordkeeping metadata set is applicable to a variety of information systems, file types, and record types, such as:

- Word processing documents
- E-mail
- Databases
- Data warehouses
- Web pages
- Spatial data
- Graphical files
- Microforms
- Videotape and audio tapes
- Correspondence
- Maps

The committee recommends that the following metadata elements be mandatory for use where the guideline is adopted (definitions from the RKMS are included). Please refer to Appendix D and the RKMS for more detailed notes on individual elements.

- Agent  
A corporate entity or organizational element which is responsible for some action on or usage of a record. An individual who performs some action on a record, or who uses a record in some way. Australian element no. 1.
- Rights Management  
Policies, legislation, caveats, and/or classifications which govern or restrict access to or use of records. Australian element no. 2.
- Title  
The name given to a record. Australian element no. 3.
- Subject  
The subject or topic of a record which concisely and accurately describes the record's content. Australian element no. 4.
- Function  
The general or agency-specific business function(s) and activities which are documented by the record. Australian element no. 9.
- Date  
The dates and times at which the fundamental recordkeeping actions of creation, transaction, and registration [into a recordkeeping system] occur. Australian element no. 10.
- Aggregation Level  
The level at which the record(s) is/are being described and controlled. The level of aggregation of the unit of description [record or series level]. Australian element no. 12.
- Record Identifier  
A unique identifier for the record(s). Australian element no. 14.
- Management History  
The dates and descriptions of all records management actions performed on a record from its registration into a recordkeeping system to its disposal. Australian element no. 15.
- Location  
The current (physical or system) location of the record. Australian element no. 18.
- Disposal

Information about policies and conditions which pertain to or control the authorized disposal of records [records retention schedule information]. Australian element no. 19.

- Mandate  
A source of recordkeeping requirements [applicable laws]. A piece of legislation, formal directive, policy, standard, guideline, set of procedures, or community expectation which (explicitly or implicitly) imposes a requirement to create, keep, dispose of, or control access to and use of a record. Australian element no. 20.

The following metadata elements would be optional for use where the guideline is adopted:

- Description (strongly recommended)  
A description, in free text prose, of the content and/or purpose of the record. Australian element no. 5.
- Language  
The language of the content of the record. Australian element no. 6.
- Relation  
A link between one record item and another, or between various aggregations of records. A link between a record and another information resource. Australian element no 7.
- Coverage  
The jurisdictional, spatial, and/or temporal characteristics of the content of the record. Australian element no. 8.
- Type  
The recognized form a record takes, which governs its internal structure and relates to its transactional purpose or to the action or activity it documents [e.g., letter, report]. Australian element no. 11.
- Format  
The logical form (media and data format) and physical format (medium and extent) of the record. Australian element no. 13.
- Use History  
The dates and descriptions of both legal and illegal attempts to access and use a record, from the time of its registration into a recordkeeping system until its disposal. Australian element no. 16.
- Preservation History  
The dates and descriptions of all actions performed on a record after its registration into a recordkeeping system which ensures that the record remains readable (renderable) and

accessible for as long as it has value to the agency or department, and to the community at large. Australian element no. 17.

- Fitness for Use / Quality

NOTE: this is a new element proposed by the study committee.

This element would offer information on the record to help users determine whether the record is suitable for their particular purpose. Whether called “Fitness for Use,” “Quality,” or some other title, the element should describe (perhaps by numeric measure, free text, and/or another scheme) such record characteristics as completeness, degree of accuracy, and timeliness.

## **VI. Recommended Next Steps: Development of Minnesota Recordkeeping Metadata Guideline**

The Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee recommends that a development group be formed under the IPC to undertake the task of writing the Minnesota-specific guideline. Staff from the State Archives could continue to coordinate the work and the study committee could act in an advisory role as needed.

The size of the development group should be kept to no more than fifteen people for manageability. Membership should include representatives from state agencies and local government in the areas of records management and information technology, with two seats reserved for representatives from the Department of Administration, Information Policy Analysis Division, and the State Archives. Similar to the process for the study committee, state government participants should be nominated for the development group by IPC members. If too many names are submitted, the IPC would be asked to choose from among the pool.

Local government representatives should participate in the development process for a number of reasons. State agencies often have local government partners; a common recordkeeping metadata scheme would allow for more efficient and effective interchange of information. Local government entities will be more likely to adopt the guideline if they have a voice in its development. Many are faced with similar records-related challenges as state agencies and are also looking for practical solutions. DIG-IT and MN GRIN each have local government members and will serve as a means of recruiting participants and disseminating information to interested parties.

The committee realizes that many agencies will likely have an active interest in the development process. Given the practical need for a small, manageable working group, the committee recommends that the development group hold open meetings similar to IPC meetings where observers can offer comments and input to the core team.

While the Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard provides an excellent starting point and model for a similar Minnesota guideline, the committee has identified some general changes that will need to be made (refer to Appendix D and meeting minutes for more detail). Necessary actions include, but are not limited to:

1. Review nomenclature and revise to make consistent with Minnesota terms and naming conventions. For example, “Disposal” should become “Records Retention.”
2. Review and revise value lists. For example, under “Aggregation Level” element, value “File” has no applicability here.
3. Review and revise scheme lists (remove Australian-specific references and add all applicable standards, etc.).

4. Review and revise condition statements.
5. Revise glossary.
6. Write an introduction to the metadata set explaining purpose and use.

Although implementation issues were out of scope for the study committee, several points were raised that should be considered during development of the guideline, including:

- flexibility,
- extensibility,
- relationship to other metadata schemes in use,
- integration with commercial software packages,
- education and training,
- ongoing sponsorship and maintenance (stewardship), and
- overall coordination of implementation and use.

Committee minutes and element-level notes provide more detail.

The committee recommends that the development process allow for a review-and-comment mechanism. Drafts, progress reports, and other documents should be posted on a web site for all interested parties and distributed by e-mail to IPC, DIG-IT, and MN GRIN members who could then respond back to the development group with comments.

The last step in the development process would be the formal submission of the finalized guideline to the IPC for approval and further action. The final guideline should be applicable across all data types and agencies. Agencies with similar specific data types and issues may want to collaborate to develop particular extensions to the basic metadata set; these agreed-upon extensions should then be added to the guideline as they are finalized.

## VII. Bibliography

### 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

- Agendas, Minutes, etc. from Recordkeeping Metadata Study Committee  
<http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/metarkms.html>
- *Preserving and Disposing of Government Records*  
<http://www.admin.state.mn.us/ipo/pipa/pipa.html> (in left-side frame, PDF format)

*Statutes, Chapter 13 (Government Data Practices).*

<http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/stats/13/>

*Statutes, Chapter 15.10 (Records Delivered to Department Heads).*

<http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/stats/15/10.html>

*Statutes, Chapter 15.17 (Official Records).*

<http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/stats/15/17.html>

*Statutes, Chapter 138.163(Preservation and Disposal of Public Records).*

<http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/stats/138/163.html>

*Statutes, Chapter 138.17 (Government Records; Administration).*

<http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/stats/138/17.html>

*Statutes, Chapter 138.19 (Application for orders of the panel).*

<http://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/stats/138/19.html>

*Rules, Chapter 1205 (Department of Administration: Data Practices).*

<http://www.leg.state.mn.us/leg/statutes.htm>

# Appendix A: Proposal to study the adoption of a recordkeeping metadata standard for Minnesota state government

Offered by DIG-IT for consideration by the IPC, 17 August 2000

## Purpose

The goal of this project is to build on two proven metadata models that were recently completed in Minnesota:

- The *Trustworthy Information Systems Handbook* (produced by the Minnesota State Archives)
  - provides agencies with a methodology and tool set for establishing the authenticity and reliability of their records
- The Foundations Project (supported by the Department of Natural Resources)
  - practical approach to meta-tagging web resources
  - a metadata-sensitive search engine for state government

A Minnesota-specific recordkeeping metadata standard would:

- build on and enhance this practical framework
- provide a sound basis for improved agency record and data management
- lay the foundation for a Government Information Locator Service (GILS) system which citizens would reliably employ to locate, evaluate, and use government information and services online

## Recommendation

DIG-IT (Data Issues Group for Information Technology), MN GRIN (Minnesota Government Records and Information Network), and the Minnesota State Archives recommend the formation of a short-term committee to study the feasibility of adapting the National Archives of Australia's recordkeeping metadata standard for use by Minnesota state agencies.

## Proposed Study Process

The committee would:

- include a limited number of people (no more than nine) drawn from DIG-IT, MN GRIN, and other state agencies
- operate as a sub-group of DIG-IT under the coordination of the Minnesota State Archives
- present its findings and recommendations to DIG-IT and the IPC no later than December 22, 2000

The feasibility study would include:

- examination of implementation in Australia
- determination of whether the Australian standard is suitable for adaptation in Minnesota
- determination of what metadata would be appropriate for Minnesota state government agencies
- recommendations on how to actually develop and deliver the new standard in a practical, timely, cost-effective manner

## References

National Archives of Australia. *Recordkeeping Metadata Standard for Commonwealth Agencies* available online at: <http://www.naa.gov.au/recordkeeping/control/summary.html>

## Appendix B: Minnesota Government Business Case for Metadata and Recordkeeping Metadata Guideline

(Note: items are in no particular order)

Facilitate compliance with the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act (MGDPA).

Facilitate accountability to citizens.

Facilitate location and retrieval of records

- for increased proper public access,
- for use in a government information locator service, and
- for litigation, for business use, etc.

Reduce costs by

- reducing redundancy,
- eliminating records kept beyond retention periods, and
- decreasing development costs within agency.

Improve records management with respect to

- retention periods (short-term, permanent, archival, etc.),
- storage,
- preservation, and
- access (MGDPA).

Reduce paperwork (decrease use of hard copies) by increasing agencies' confidence in locating and managing electronic records.

Achieve greater consistency of information within and across agencies.

Facilitate sharing (when appropriate and allowed by law) within and across agencies by

- knowing what information is available and what isn't, and
- carrying out cross-agency queries (Big Plan component).

Reduce the number of ad-hoc, agency-specific, recordkeeping metadata schemes.

Provide recordkeeping metadata standards and guidance for consultants and vendors to allow

- easy reference,
- consistency, and
- agency projects to build on what others have done.

Provide pointers to other related metadata (data dictionaries, etc. – metadata for metadata).

Increase the reliability of recordkeeping metadata; reduce errors.

## Appendix C: Evaluation Criteria Applied to Australian Recordkeeping Metadata Standard

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. Is [specific element] applicable to non-electronic records?
7. Is [specific element] part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?
8. Can [specific element] be automatically captured and, if so, how?
9. Should [specific element] be mandatory or optional?

## Appendix D: Results of Element-Level Study

### Evaluation of “Agent” element (AU No. 1)

Definition: A corporate entity or organizational element which is responsible for some action on or usage of a record. An individual who performs some action on a record, or who uses a record in some way.

There is nothing under “Agent” per se. All information under this element (and the others) is contained within the sub-elements. To layer metadata information and capture all the information an agency might want to, Agent and its associated sub-elements are repeatable.

Under values for Agent Type, should Document Author and Record Creator be collapsed together?

Probably the “Section” sub-element should be re-titled “Organizational Unit” for Minnesota purposes.

If agency-specific codes are used for values, agencies will need to keep those codes even after they change for at least as long as the longest retention period of the records whose metadata references those codes.

Rather than saying “uses” records, say “manages” records – to avoid confusion with the end users of the records.

The audit trail of record use may itself become a record (e-commerce example of someone reading and accepting terms of use).

1. Will “Agent” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Agent” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes.**
3. Does “Agent” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Agent” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Agent” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Agent” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Agent” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Similar to Contributor, author, publisher in DC scheme. Originator in federal GILS scheme. Author, publisher in GIS.**
8. Can “Agent” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Perhaps default value could be automated.**

**Evaluation of “Agent ” element (AU No. 1) – continued**

9. Should “Agent” be mandatory or optional?

**Mandatory.**

**1.1 (Agent Type): Mandatory**

**1.2 (Jurisdiction): Optional**

**1.3 (Corporate ID): Mandatory**

**1.4 (Corporate Name): Mandatory**

**1.5 (Person ID): Mandatory (in cases of government employees, employee ID number)**

**1.6 (Personal Name): Mandatory**

**1.7 (Section Name): Mandatory when available (rename “Organizational Unit”)**

**1.8 (Position Name): Optional**

**1.9 (Contact Details): Optional**

**1.10 (E-mail): Optional**

**1.11 (Digital Signature): Optional**

## Evaluation of “Rights Management” element (AU No. 2)

Definition: Policies, legislation, caveats, and/or classifications which govern or restrict access to or use of records.

Agencies will have different needs beyond the requirements of the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act (federal regulations, HIPAA, 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.

1. Will “Rights Management” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Rights Management” 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 “Rights Management” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Rights Management” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes, enables lawful retrieval.**
5. Does “Rights Management” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes, enables lawful retrieval.**
6. Is “Rights Management” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Rights Management” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (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.**

**Evaluation of “Rights Management” element (AU No. 2) – continued**

8. Can “Rights Management” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Capturing this element is potentially challenging.**

9. Should “Rights Management” be mandatory or optional?

**Mandatory**

**2.1 ( Security Classification): Mandatory**

**2.2 (Caveat), 2.3 (Codeword), 2.4 (Releasability Indicator), 2.5 (Access Status), 2.6 (Usage Condition), 2.7 (Encryption Details): determination of whether mandatory or optional will depend on how each is defined.**

### **Evaluation of “Title” element (AU No. 3)**

Definition: The name given to a record.

1. Will “Title” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Title” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes.**
3. Does “Title” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Title” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Title” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Title” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Title” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government ( Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core uses Title elements, as does the MN GIS scheme.**
8. Can “Title” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Will probably require user input.**
9. Should “Title” be mandatory or optional?  
**Mandatory**
  - 3.1 ( Scheme Type): Eliminate this sub-element**
  - 3.2 (Scheme Name): Eliminate this sub-element**
  - 3.3 (Title Words): Mandatory (actual title)**
  - 3.4 (Alternative): Optional**

#### **Evaluation of “Subject” element (AU No. 4)**

Definition: The subject or topic of a record which concisely and accurately describes the record’s content.

Use of this element will require a big educational push for agencies and records creators.

This will be crucial for locating/searching for records.

\*\* Will need a controlled vocabulary and thesaurus – should work with system established by Eileen Quam of DNR (Foundations Project, North Star).

Drop sub-elements 4.2, 4.3 – can show hierarchies in other ways (need to follow Foundations scheme or set different one).

Will need to re-work comments to reflect changes.

1. Will “Subject” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Subject” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes.**
3. Does “Subject” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Subject” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Subject” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Subject” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Subject” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core uses Subject elements; MN GIS scheme uses Keywords.**
8. Can “Subject” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**No. Artificial intelligence not very good at assigning subject words automatically – would need to do this manually as part of work flow.**
9. Should “Subject” be mandatory or optional?  
**Mandatory**  
**4.1 (Keyword): Mandatory (rename to “subject”)**  
**4.2 (Second Level Keyword): Eliminate this sub-element**  
**4.3 (Third Level Keyword): Eliminate this sub-element**

### **Evaluation of “Description” element (AU No. 5)**

Definition: A description, in free text prose, of the content and/or purpose of the record.

Why is this repeatable when it’s a free-text field?

Search engines will favor information in this element – shows up as description in results lists.

1. Will “Description” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes, but this level of detail may not always be necessary.**
2. Does “Description” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**No.**
3. Does “Description” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Maybe.**
4. Does “Description” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Description” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Description” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Description” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core uses Description; MN GIS scheme uses Abstract.**
8. Can “Description” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Free text must be entered manually.**
9. Should “Description” be mandatory or optional?  
**Optional, but strongly recommended to facilitate searching.**

## **Evaluation of “Language” element (AU No. 6)**

Definition: The language of the content of the record.

After discussion, group decided to keep title as “Language” rather than changing it to “Language Code.”

Scheme should point to ISO standard 639-1 (used by Foundations Project web page tagging as well).

What about being able to search in other languages? Implementation issue? Perhaps use subject words in appropriate language.

1. Will “Language” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**No, some agencies may not use languages other than English.**
2. Does “Language” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Maybe, for access purposes.**
3. Does “Language” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Maybe, in terms of access/distribution policies.**
4. Does “Language” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Language” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**No.**
6. Is “Language” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Language” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core uses Language element.**
8. Can “Language” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Could be automatic (default as English).**
9. Should “Language” be mandatory or optional?  
**Optional.**

### Evaluation of “Relation” element (AU No. 7)

Definition: A link between one record item and another, or between various aggregations of records. A link between a record and another information resource.

Perhaps difficult to maintain and to draw clear connections.

Need for unique record IDs if used.

Could indicate versioning.

1. Will “Relation” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Not necessarily – not all records are inter-linked.**
2. Does “Relation” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Maybe.**
3. Does “Relation” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Maybe.**
4. Does “Relation” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Relation” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Relation” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Relation” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core uses Relation element.**
8. Can “Relation” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Defaults could be automatically generated.**
9. Should “Relation” be mandatory or optional?  
**Optional, but if chosen, 7.1 (Related Item ID) and 7.2 (Relation Type) are Mandatory; 7.3 (Relation Description) is optional.**

## Evaluation of “Coverage” element (AU No. 8)

Definition: The jurisdictional, spatial, and/or temporal characteristics of the content of the record.

Will need to review and change values lists.

It would be best to have a place names thesaurus shared among agencies. Getty Thesaurus referenced in standard is museum oriented and doesn't work for Minnesota. Perhaps a FIPS or GIS naming scheme could be used. Perhaps organize a working group to tackle this and to come up with a Minnesota-specific scheme.

MN GIS / FGDC spatial data metadata set much richer.

\*\* Standard developers should work with GIS community on this one (DNR, LMIC).

1. Will “Coverage” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes, but not all will need this level of detail.**
2. Does “Coverage” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**No.**
3. Does “Coverage” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Maybe, with respect to policies.**
4. Does “Coverage” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Coverage” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Coverage” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Coverage” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core uses Coverage element; MN GIS scheme is centered around such spatial descriptions.**
8. Can “Coverage” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Could be system generated.**
9. Should “Coverage” be mandatory or optional?  
**Optional.**  
**8.1 (Jurisdiction): Optional**  
**8.2 (Place Name): Optional**  
**8.3 (Period Name): Optional. Perhaps make into a free-text field to allow for narrative context regarding currency of data.**  
  
**Perhaps add sub-element for spatial boundaries (latitude, longitude, etc.)**

### **Evaluation of “Function” element (AU No. 9)**

Definition: The general or agency-specific business function(s) and activities which are documented by the record.

\*\* Need for controlled vocabulary and thesaurus.

Take out links to Title element.

1. Will “Function” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Function” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**No.**
3. Does “Function” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Function” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Function” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Function” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Function” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core, MN GIS scheme don’t have similar.**
8. Can “Function” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Probably not automatically**
9. Should “Function” be mandatory or optional?  
**Mandatory.**  
**9.1 (Function Descriptor): Mandatory**  
**9.2 (Activity Descriptor): Mandatory**  
**9.3 (Third Level Descriptor): Optional**

## **Evaluation of “Date” element (AU No. 10)**

Definition: The dates and times at which the fundamental recordkeeping actions of creation, transaction, and registration [into a recordkeeping system] occur.

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 format for date range.

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

1. Will “Date” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Date” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes.**
3. Does “Date” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes, but not sufficient on its own.**
4. Does “Date” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Date” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes, supports date range.**
6. Is “Date” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Can be applicable, depending on level of detail.**
7. Is “Date” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (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.**
8. Can “Date” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**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 “Date” be mandatory or optional?  
**Mandatory.**  
**10.1 (Date/Time Created): Mandatory**  
**10.2 (Date/Time Transacted): To be determined**  
**10.3 (Date/Time Registered): Mandatory**

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

### **Evaluation of “Type” element (AU No. 11)**

Definition: The recognized form a record takes, which governs its internal structure and relates to its transactional purpose or to the action or activity it documents [e.g., letter, report].

Will need to review values list and make sure that it is agency-extensible.

1. Will “Type” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Type” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**No.**
3. Does “Type” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Type” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Type” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Type” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Type” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government ( Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core uses Type.**
8. Can “Type” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Perhaps automatically.**
9. Should “Type” be mandatory or optional?  
**Optional.**

### **Evaluation of “Aggregation Level” element (AU No. 12)**

Definition: The level at which the record(s) is/are being described and controlled. The level of aggregation of the unit of description [record or series level].

Values will need to be re-defined.

1. Will “Aggregation Level” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Aggregation Level” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes.**
3. Does “Aggregation Level” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Aggregation Level” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Aggregation Level” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Aggregation Level” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Aggregation Level” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core does not have a similar element.**
8. Can “Aggregation Level” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Perhaps not captured automatically – may need to be manually entered.**
9. Should “Aggregation Level” be mandatory or optional?  
**Mandatory.**

### **Evaluation of “Format” element (AU No. 13)**

Definition: The logical form (media and data format) and physical format (medium and extent) of the record.

Helpful for providing access and doing proper preservation management.

If records in a series stored in more than one format, perhaps indicate that at the series level.

This element can be used to indicate software packages, versions, etc. (see examples).

Is there some way to combine sub-elements while maintaining utility?

Be aware of data publishing issues (more than one format; multiple formats zipped together, etc.).

1. Will “Format” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Format” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**No.**
3. Does “Format” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Format” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Format” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Format” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Format” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core and MN GIS scheme use Format.**
8. Can “Format” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Probably captured automatically.**
9. Should “Format” be mandatory or optional?  
**Optional, but strongly recommended where there are preservation management issues and certain data types (i.e., spatial data)**  
**13.1 (Media Format): Mandatory**  
**13.2 (Data Format): Mandatory**  
**13.3 (Medium): Mandatory**  
**13.4 (Extent): Optional**

## Evaluation of “Record Identifier” element (AU No. 14)

Definition: A unique identifier for the record(s).

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 “Record Identifier” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Record Identifier” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes.**
3. Does “Record Identifier” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Record Identifier” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Record Identifier” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Record Identifier” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes, mandatory within recordkeeping system.**
7. Is “Record Identifier” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core has Identifier element. MN GIS has MN Clearinghouse ID.**
8. Can “Record Identifier” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Should be fairly easy to capture for electronic records, perhaps not as easy with respect to non-electronic.**
9. Should “Record Identifier” be mandatory or optional?  
**Mandatory for electronic records within recordkeeping system.**

### Evaluation of “Management History” element (AU No. 15)

Definition: The dates and descriptions of all records management actions performed on a record from its registration into a recordkeeping system to its disposal.

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 doesn’t seem to necessarily mean “duplicates” as we might interpret it (see Use History, RKMS, p. 98).

Note the Freedom of Information Act only applies to federal agencies. Access to Minnesota state-owned data is governed by the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act.

1. Will “Management History” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?

**Yes.**

2. Does “Management History” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?

**Yes.**

3. Does “Management History” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?

**Yes, with extensions.**

4. Does “Management History” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?

**Yes.**

5. Does “Management History” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?

**Yes.**

6. Is “Management History” applicable to non-electronic records?

**Yes.**

7. Is “Management History” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?

**Dublin Core and MN GIS schemes do not.**

8. Can “Management History” be automatically captured and, if so, how?

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

9. Should “Management History” be mandatory or optional?

**Mandatory.**

**15.1 (Event Date/Time): Mandatory**

**15.2 (Event Type): Mandatory**

**15.3 (Event Description): Mandatory**

### **Evaluation of “Use History” element (AU No. 16)**

Definition: The dates and descriptions of both legal and illegal attempts to access and use a record, from the time of its registration into a recordkeeping system until its disposal.

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 be significant (e.g., downloading personnel records).

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

1. Will “Use History” 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 “Use History” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes.**
3. Does “Use History” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Maybe.**
4. Does “Use History” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Use History” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Use History” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes, although could be difficult.**
7. Is “Use History” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core and MN GIS schemes do not.**
8. Can “Use History” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Parts may be automatically captured.**
9. Should “Use History” be mandatory or optional?  
**Optional, but if chosen, the 16.1 (Use Date/Time), 16.2 (Use Type), and 16.3 (Use Description) are all mandatory.**

### Evaluation of “Preservation History” element (AU No. 17)

Definition: The dates and descriptions of all actions performed on a record after its registration into a recordkeeping system which ensures that the record remains readable (renderable) and accessible for as long as it has value to the agency or department, and to the community at large.

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 “Preservation History” 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 “Preservation History” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes, in terms of ensuring accessibility over time.**
3. Does “Preservation History” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes, in terms of ensuring accessibility over time.**
4. Does “Preservation History” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Preservation History” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Preservation History” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Preservation History” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core and MN GIS schemes do not.**
8. Can “Preservation History” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Some parts may be automatically captured.**
9. Should “Preservation History” be mandatory or optional?  
**Optional, but if chosen 17.1 (Action Date/Time), 17.2 (Action Type), and 17.3(Action Description) are mandatory; 17.4 (Next Action) and 17.5 (Next Action Due) are optional.**

### **Evaluation of “Location” element (AU No. 18)**

Definition: The current (physical or system) location of the record.

Need to know if information is held by more than one agency or across agency boundaries. Interoperability and data sharing/distribution issues.

Need to look at repeatability. Can “relationship” element fit in here?

1. Will “Location” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Location” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes, for access.**
3. Does “Location” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Location” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Location” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Location” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Location” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core does not have similar; MN GIS has Online Linkage.**
8. Can “Location” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Probably can be automatically captured.**
9. Should “Location” be mandatory or optional?  
**Mandatory (for all records, electronic and non-electronic).**  
**18.1 (Current Location): Mandatory**  
**18.2 (Home Location Details): Mandatory**  
**18.3 (Home Storage Details): Mandatory**  
**18.4 (Recordkeeping System ID): Optional**

## Evaluation of “Disposal” element (AU No. 19)

Definition: Information about policies and conditions which pertain to or control the authorized disposal of records [records retention schedule information].

\*\* 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 “Disposal” apply to any agency, no matter what the business activities of that agency may be?  
**Yes.**
2. Does “Disposal” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes.**
3. Does “Disposal” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes, with extensions.**
4. Does “Disposal” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Disposal” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Disposal” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Disposal” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core, MN GIS schemes do not.**
8. Can “Disposal” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**Portions can be automatically captured.**
9. Should “Disposal” be mandatory or optional?  
**Mandatory.**  
**19.1 (Disposal Authorization): Mandatory**  
**19.2 (Sentence): Mandatory. Rename to “Retention Period”**  
**19.3 (Disposal Action Due): To be determined – mandatory? Rename to “Disposal Due Date”**

#### **19.4 (Disposal Status): Optional**

## Evaluation of “Mandate” element (AU No. 20)

Definition: A source of recordkeeping requirements [applicable laws]. A piece of legislation, formal directive, policy, standard, guideline, set of procedures, or community expectation which (explicitly or implicitly) imposes a requirement to create, keep, dispose of, or control access to and use of a record.

All agencies governed by certain Minnesota laws -- Minnesota Statutes: MS15.10, MS15.17, MS138.17, MS138.163, MS Chapter 13 (MGDPA), MS Chapter 325L (Uniform Electronic Transactions Act), Minnesota Rules: MR1205, as well as records retention schedules, industry-specific regulations (like HIPAA), etc.

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

For documentation of actions, for education purposes.

1. Will “Mandate” 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 “Mandate” facilitate proper records management with respect to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act?  
**Yes.**
3. Does “Mandate” accommodate current agency-specific records management practices, retention schedules, and policies?  
**Yes.**
4. Does “Mandate” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the individual record level? Is it applicable at the record level?  
**Yes.**
5. Does “Mandate” enable description, discovery, and retrieval at the record-series level? Is it applicable at the series level?  
**Yes.**
6. Is “Mandate” applicable to non-electronic records?  
**Yes.**
7. Is “Mandate” part of a different metadata set that is already in use in Minnesota government (Foundations web metadata, etc.)? If close, what are the discrepancies?  
**Dublin Core and MN GIS schemes do not.**
8. Can “Mandate” be automatically captured and, if so, how?  
**These could be automatically captured at series level and inherited by lower levels of records.**
9. Should “Mandate” be mandatory or optional?  
**Mandatory, with level of application (series or records) determined within each agency.**  
**20.1 (Mandate Type): Mandatory**  
**20.2 (Refers To): Mandatory**  
**20.3 (Mandate Name): Mandatory**  
**20.4 (Mandate Reference): Mandatory**  
**20.5 (Requirement): Mandatory**

**“Fitness For Use” / “Quality” (element no. 21)**

**Please Note:** NOTE: this is a new element proposed by the study committee.

This element would offer information on the record to help users determine whether the record is suitable for their particular purpose. Whether called “Fitness for Use,” “Quality,” or some other title, the element should describe (perhaps by numeric measure, free text, and/or another scheme) such record characteristics as completeness, degree of accuracy, and timeliness.

## Appendix E: Glossary

### **Electronic Record:**

“A record created, generated, sent, communicated, received, or stored by electronic means.” (Minnesota Statutes, section 325L.02)

### **Information:**

“Data, text, images, sounds, codes, computer programs, software, databases, or the like.” (Minnesota Statutes, section 325L.02)

### **Metadata:**

Data about data. Information that is used to facilitate intellectual control of , and structured access to, other information.

### **Record:**

“All cards, correspondence, discs, maps, memoranda, microfilms, papers, photographs, recordings, reports, tapes, writings 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 term “records” excludes data and information that does not become part of an official transaction, library and museum material made or acquired and kept solely for reference or exhibit purposes, extra copies of documents kept only for convenience of reference and stock of publications and processed documents, and bonds, coupons, or other obligations or evidence of indebtedness, the destruction or other disposition of which is governed by other laws.” (Minnesota Statutes, section 138.17, subd. 1)

“Information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or that is stored in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.” (Minnesota Statutes, section 325L.02)

### **Record Series:**

Records arranged according to a filing system or kept together because they relate to a particular subject or function or result from the same activity.

### **Records Management:**

The planning, controlling, directing, organizing, training, promoting, and other managerial activities related to the creation, maintenance, use, and disposition of records. See also “Recordkeeping.”

**Records Retention Schedule:**

A plan for the management of records listing types of records and how long they should be kept, the purpose of which is to provide continuing authority to dispose of or transfer records to the State Archives.

**Recordkeeping:**

The act or process of creating, maintaining, and disposing of records. See also “Records Management.”