

OVERVIEW

- This group consisted of 15 persons from 10 countries (see attachment).
- There was a lot of enthusiasm for doing more with MoReq, without delay. It is seen as a useful tool to promote good record-keeping for electronic records.
- Different countries vary greatly in how they have used MoReq. Some have adopted it in a widespread way, while in others it is little-known.

KEY POINTS

We discussed the following key points:

- **MoReq Management Regime:** At the moment the intellectual property of MoReq belongs to the European Commission. If this does not change, DLM Forum will be constrained by the inability of the EC to move quickly and decisively, and will be powerless to make sure that MoReq stays internally consistent and remains a good quality product – in effect an EC programme, which has a short life expectancy, would remain in control while DLM Forum is only an interested observer. So, if DLM Forum wants to take the lead changing or developing MoReq in any way we need to find a new “governance” or management regime. We cannot reasonably maintain something which belongs to someone else.
- **Translations:** There are several translations of MoReq already (Dutch, German, Italian Serbo-Croat, Spanish and Portuguese in full, French in part, Hungarian and Slovenian informally). However, the status of some of these translations is not clear – for example, some may include the addition of national requirements – and it would be good to clarify this for all potential users. Also, in some countries, the absence of a translation is a barrier to adoption.
- **Certification and Certifying:** *Note: during the meeting, there was much discussion and confusion around the words “certification” and “certifying”. To avoid confusion, the rest of this note avoids both words; instead it uses:*
 - “software compliance testing” to mean “certification”, that is the testing of software products against the MoReq specification;
 - “endorsement” to mean “certifying”, that is the process of assuring the value of MoReq as a standard or recommendation.

Software Compliance Testing: There is a lot of demand, from users and from software suppliers, for a MoReq software compliance testing scheme. It would be especially valuable in some accession states, where it is difficult to formulate guidance but where demand is expected to be high. We discussed this at length, and took into account especially the views and experience of the UK National Archives, which runs an approval scheme. We concluded that this kind of scheme is a major and complex undertaking, not a small project. Any decision to proceed with it:

- needs clarity – exactly what is being tested; exactly why; exactly what limitations are there; and who is the testing for.
- would require careful researching, on several fronts (e.g. what liabilities would the testing authority have if it “fails” a product and the supplier disagrees; how the process would cope with language and localisation issues);
- would probably need a new legal entity (because the EEIG brings unlimited liability on its owners, and National Archives could not agree to unlimited liability in this context);
- would require a large investment of effort and of money (several people for several months. The UK National Archives representative described its UK approval organisation, which consists of three full time staff, with over a dozen applications being handled at once, each application using up several dozens of work-days);
- might recover all or some of its set-up costs eventually (suppliers would be willing to pay for testing).

Endorsement: Several countries, particularly some accession states, would like to see a greater degree of endorsement of MoReq. This endorsement might make use of MoReq a strong recommendation, for example.

- **Development of MoReq:** There was a widespread desire to do more with MoReq, both to develop it or improve it, and to support its use throughout Europe. We had many suggestions in this area; they included:
 - Development of a graphical model which shows ERM-related standards and guidance, such as MoReq, OAIS, ISO 15489 etc., showing how they are related and what part of electronic records management they address. This would be a useful tool for explaining the status of MoReq to managers, project teams and others. We did not discuss whether nationally-developed standards and guidance would be included; this could be an important question. (Post-meeting note: AIIM has developed a visual map of electronic content management technologies and functions, in the form of an A1-size poster; this does not address standards, but might be an input).
 - “Harvesting” the suggestions and comments which are already in the DLM Forum’s e-mail account.
 - A “senior management digest”, perhaps backed by a PowerPoint presentation, to explain to senior management what the ERM problem is and how MoReq can play a part in addressing it.
 - Training and communications events such as workshops or seminars, including the availability of materials to run these events.
 - More detail on the interface between records-generating institutions and Archives.
 - Additional functionality or enhancements such as e-mail management, electronic signatures, offline or remote working, collaborative working, casework, a more detailed metadata model, inheritance and evolution of metadata, non-functional requirements (we did not discuss all of these). We noted that these can *only* be worked on by DLM Forum *if* a new maintenance regime is agreed for MoReq.

These developments all suggest the need for funding, save for some training or communications events which might be self-funding. We did not discuss the amounts or sources of funding in any detail.

Note that on the basis of this Dublin meeting we are not able to prioritise the work; for one thing there has not been time to consider each suggestion and its impact fully, and for another we have no knowledge of changes requested by MoReq users via the DLM Forum e-mail account. So, while there was, for example, a consensus that work on metadata has a relatively high importance, detailed consideration is needed before agreeing exactly what work to undertake next.

Other points were discussed only briefly, without any conclusion being reached. These include:

- Development of a Europe-wide classification scheme.
- Identification of a “core” part of MoReq for compliance purposes.
- The importance of impressing on the IDA BC programme the importance of records management (because, for example, “data” in the context of IDA very often means “records”).
- Establishment of an network of MoReq “advocates (probably one per country) and/or an internet discussion list on MoReq.

SUGGESTIONS FOR ACTION

It is difficult to make concrete recommendations without analysing costs, effort required, how actions will be managed and so on. The following table contains suggestions for immediate action, including who should take the lead and by when. The following abbreviations are used in the “Who?” column:

- DLM IE: DLM Forum Interim Executive.
- Ed Bd: MoReq Editorial Board.

What?	When?	Who?
<p>1. Influence Ministers: We should try to ensure that the Expert Group report on Archives in the EU mentions, in its executive summary, the importance of MoReq to archives and the need to develop, promote and translate it (Malcolm Todd volunteered to undertake this urgent action, as the summary is being drafted by his Chief Executive).</p>	Mar 04	Todd
<p>2. Transfer ownership to the EEIG: Open negotiations with IDA to transfer intellectual control of MoReq to the DLM Network European Economic Interest Group, that is the right to develop it further without permission of the EC. It was pointed out that the EEIG is very new, and not mature. There may be an argument for delaying a transfer for this reason. However, negotiations are likely to take a long time; this would result in the necessary delay. So it would be appropriate to take the following actions as soon as possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ get the EEIG to agree to this; □ make formal contact with IDA to initiate negotiation. 	Apr 04	DLM IE
<p>3. Use existing feedback: Obtain and analyse the existing DLM e-mail mailbox (dlm-forum@cec.eu.int) which contains feedback on MoReq, as an input to later steps. We presume that this e-mail account is with the Commission, and as every copy of MoReq printed or downloaded contains a link to this address, we also presume it may contain valuable feedback. This suggestion in effect is a formal request to commission to hand over to the DLM Forum the contents of this DLM Forum mailbox. This can, and should, be done at once.</p>	Apr 04	DLM IE
<p>4. Form an Editorial Board: After the EEIG has intellectual control of MoReq, form a small “MoReq Editorial Board” of about 5 – 6 persons to prioritise and then manage development work. As MoReq is intended explicitly for use in all sectors, the private sector (e.g. software suppliers) should be taken into account. This is an essential activity as we have identified many possible developments, and the DLM Forum mailbox presumably contains ideas for several more.</p>	Apr 04	DLM IE
<p>5. Translations: Request that the EC fund “official” translations of MoReq into all EU languages, but only after the first round of enhancements (see suggestion 6). The justification for this is in view of the Union’s enlargement, and the fact that absence of a translation is a significant barrier to use. The request should be lodged now, even though actual translation work will not be needed for several months, so that translation resources can be scheduled. Several of the translations should use existing translations as a starting point in order to minimise costs.</p>	Apr 04	DLM IE
<p>6. Commission development of MoReq: After potential ideas have been prioritised by the MoReq Editorial Board, with the co-operation of the EC, commission the priority developments. These are likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Some non-functional requirements (in order to re-use the 2003 procurement), though reflecting current perceived needs (e.g. relationship to ISO 15489, relationship to e-government, need for corporate policies) rather than the original specification; □ A “refresh” of the document (to correct and update it); □ Specific additional work prioritised by the Editorial Board. 	May 04	Ed Bd
<p>7. Investigate compliance testing: Perform or commission a feasibility study to investigate the issues related to software compliance testing. As well as researching the issues across the entire Union, this could include a survey of software suppliers. The result of the study should be a series of recommendations on how to address the issues, plus financial and organisational models.</p>	Jun 04	DLM IE

What?	When?	Who?
<p>8. Graphical model: Develop a graphical model which shows ERM-related “standards”. This is a small, quick, action. It is not directly related to the content of MoReq, and so this can be started without a management regime or Editorial Board.</p>	?	?
<p>9. Training: Develop material for training and communications events, including supporting materials such as presentations and handouts, presumably in a form which can easily be translated. By way of example, one initial suggestion (not yet discussed properly) is a 2 – 3 day workshop. Timing was not discussed; there is a tension between immediate demand from some countries and the benefit of waiting until after the revision of MoReq.</p>	?	?

CONCLUSION

The representative from one of the accession countries summed up the general feeling at the end of the first day in just two words: **BE QUICK**.

ATTACHMENT: WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

Alain Gresse	PricewaterhouseCoopers, Luxembourg
Maria Luisa Conde	General Administration Archives Spain
Marc Fresko	Cornwell Management Consultants plc (UK) (<i>rapporteur</i>)
Inta Feldmane	National Archives of Latvia
Pierre Fuzeau	Serda Group/Archimag (France)
Torbjorn Hornfeldt	National Archives of Sweden (<i>Chairman</i>)
Goran Kristiansson	National Archives of Sweden
Sonja Jager	Government Centre for Informatics (Slovenia)
Markku Maenpaa	National Archives of Finland
Zoltan Szoke	National Archives of Hungary
Jean-Pierre Teil	National Archives of France
Malcolm Todd	National Archives of the UK
Hubert Wajs	National Archives of Poland
Martin Waldron	In-Form Consult (UK)
Karl Wessbrandt	Statskontoret (Swedish Agency for Public Management)