DLM FORUM

Findings of the MoReq working group
19/20 October 2004, The Hague

ATTENDANCE

The following attended this working group:

- Tilt Arumae, National Archives of Estonia
- Maria Luisa Conde, General Administration Archives, Spain
- Inta Feldmane, National Archives Latvia
- Ivan Fonnes, National Archives of Norway
- Marc Fresko, Cornwell Management Consultants plc, UK *(minutes)*
- Alain Gresse, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Luxembourg
- Hans Hofman, ERPANET, The Netherlands
- Torbjörn Hörnfeldt, National Archives of Sweden *(chair)*
- Sonja Jager, Government Centre for Informatics, Slovenia
- Walter Koch, AIT-Forschungsgesellschaft MBH, Germany
- Philip Lord, The Digital Archiving Consultancy Ltd., UK
- Ian Macfarlane, The National Archives, UK
- Markku Maenke, Provincial Archives of Hämeelinna, Finland
- Seamus Ross, University of Glasgow, UK
- Trond Sirevåg, National Archives of Norway
- Paul Sutcliffe, In-form Consult Ltd., UK
- Jean-Pierre Teil, Centre des Archives Contemporaines, France
- Stephanie Waeyenbergh, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
- Huber Wajs, National Archives of Poland

The group divided into two for most of the time. The first half of the group addressed priorities and mechanism for updating MoReq. The second half addressed other issues. The following describes the conclusions reached in both cases.

UPDATES TO MOREQ

There was general agreement that we need to update MoReq maintaining compatibility with the original version as much as possible, rather than changing it radically. The sub-group identified both actions and priorities. The actions are summarised in the following table.

What?	Who?	When?
1. Circulate ISO 15489 questionnaire to working group (WG) members for comment. The first priority is to invite comments on MoReq, from all interested parties. The first step will be to circulate the (existing) questionnaire ISO 15489 review questionnaire to the WG members.	T. Hörnfeldt	
2. Return comments to I. Macfarlane. All WG members to return comments to I. Macfarlane.	All WG	15 Nov. 04
3. Prepare MoReq questionnaire. Develop and finalise questionnaire, and send to A. Gresse for posting.	I. Macfarlane	Nov. 04
4. Post questionnaire on DLM website.	A. Gresse	Dec. 04
5. Ask National Archives to link to questionnaire. Write to National Archives (and potentially others, e.g. professional bodies?) asking them to add links from their website to the MoReq questionnaire web page. Text for this request to be drafted by T. Hörnfeldt, T. Sirevåg and I. Fonnes.	T. Hörnfeldt T. Sirevåg I. Fonnes	Dec. 04
6. Assemble results of questionnaire responses. The collaboration software already available on the DLM website may be used to do this work. The assembled results will be one input to decide priorities for MoReq update work.		Mar. 05
7. Liaise with Monash University (Australia) MoReq review. As part of the ISO 23081 work, a team at Monash is reviewing the MoReq metadata model. They are to be contacted to provide another input to the MoReq update work.		

The priorities for updates identified so far are (in decreasing order of importance):

- **Metadata model:** revise to take account of ISO 23081 (and other developments since 2001?), and clarify relationships to functional requirements;
- **Data model**: review structure to make more flexible, to enable electronic archiving (e.g. virtual, overlapping files);
- **Transfer standards:** add requirements dealing with standards for exchange formats and repository transfer.
- **Other:**
  - Security requirements;
  - Long-term preservation and availability requirements;
  - Validate against ISO 15489.
  - Website transaction management requirements.

OTHER ACTIONS

In the absence of definite information about funding, the sub-group limited discussions to actions which can be completed without cost (by voluntary effort) or which are self-funding.

For this reason, and also due to lack of time, the subject of testing software against MoReq was not explored further. However, it seems that there is still interest in this topic. *(post-meeting note: there is currently an initiative to set up a Dutch company to test software against the Dutch version of MoReq).*

The actions can be divided naturally into two types:

- Actions which can, and should, be undertaken by the DLM Forum;

- Actions which cannot be undertaken by the DLM Forum because they require specialist national knowledge or language skills. These actions are naturally "assigned" to National Archives, or to be precise to those National Archives which *want* to take these actions. **In practice, this means that DLM Forum members will be asked to take the lead in their own country, to try to get their National Archives to perform these actions.**

It is important to understand that some actions are in great demand by some countries but not by others. So it is not essential, or expected, that all countries (i.e. all National Archives) will undertake all actions.

The actions are listed below, along with names of those responsible for their execution and deadlines for their completion. In all cases, completion earlier than the deadline date will be beneficial.

What?	Who?	When?
1. Seek endorsement from EBNA (European Board of National Archives, and send to Several countries – in particular some smaller recent EU accession countries – have a strong need to get an authoritative endorsement for MoReq, to assist them in promoting its use. However, the group was unable to identify one definitive, authoritative entity to provide such endorsement. This action is therefore in support of an alternative, which is to obtain and publish as many endorsements as possible, from National Archives, trade bodies and other appropriate organisations.	C. Granstrom	Oct. 04
2. Check legal/IPR situation. The group is under the impression that DLM Forum cannot make changes to MoReq because the copyright (IPR) rests with the European Commission. However, the group was unsure of this. The action is therefore to contact the Commission to check on the situation, and (if necessary) to ask for the Commission to transfer IPR to, or to grant update rights to, DLM Forum.	T. Hörnfeldt, H. Hofmann (EC)	Oct. 04
3. Specify/Develop 2-day training event. Some countries have a need for training about MoReq – specifically, training for those who will go on to train others (i.e. "train-the-trainers"). It was agreed tentatively that this might be a two-day training session, in English, to be delivered as many times as necessary. The first step is for those who are most interested to draft a course outline and send it to Atle Skjekelland and Marc Fresko.	A. Gresse, H.Wajs, M. L. Conde	Oct. 04
4. Obtain comments on MoReq from EC. Every copy of MoReq includes an e-mail address for comments (dlm-forum@cec.eu.int). We do not know what may be in this mailbox, or whether it still exists. This action is to request a copy of all comments received by this mailbox.	M. Fresko	Nov. 04

What?	Who?	When?
5. Implement website enhancements. This action is twofold: ■ Inform DLM Forum members about the existing collaborative working tools on the DLM website. All DLM members will then be able to use these facilities to exchange drafts, lodge documents etc. as they work together. ■ Provide a web page for endorsements (see 1. and 6.) This is envisaged as a simple page which will display something like a logo and a short message of endorsement from each endorsing body.	All	Dec. 05
6. Seek endorsements from National Archives and other bodies and send to A. Gresse. This is the same as 1. above, but for: ■ National Archives; ■ Professional bodies (e.g. Records Management Society, ICA, AIIM?); ■ Other major archives (e.g. State archives?); ■ Other influential entities (e.g. relevant Ministries or Directorates, standards setting bodies in government?). All DLM members are asked to do this. Alain Gresse will post the endorsements on the web page when he receives them.	All	Feb. 05
7. Post multi-lingual glossary (MoReq ch.13.1) on DLM Forum website. At the request of several countries, this action aims to build a web page which collects glossaries of all MoReq terminology on one page. The terminology is defined in MoReq chapter 13 section 1. We already know of 8 or 9 translations *(post-meeting note: M. Fresko volunteers to collect these together in a consistent format, and to inform members of the languages involved).* For all other languages, members are asked to kindly produce a translation of the MoReq glossary (chapter 13 section 1) and to send it to M. Fresko.	All	Mar. 05
8. Produce and post a "chapter zero" on DLM website. Many or most languages differ profoundly in their treatment of some key MoReq concepts (in particular "records"). In response to this, the translators of the Portuguese and Slovenian versions of MoReq added a short new chapter, which they produced locally, to introduce the basic concepts of MoReq in terms which make sense in Portuguese and Slovenian. This new chapter is referred to as "chapter zero". This action is to produce a comparable "chapter zero" in other languages. It could be based on, or similar to, the Portuguese and Slovenian chapters; however, this is not necessary, and in some languages it may be desirable to make it very different.	All	Mar. 05