DATE: 9 JANUARY 2003　　　　　　　　　**LOCATION: OHIO HISTORICAL CENTER**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS					
Chair:	Charlie Arp	✔			
Members:	Doug Alt	✔		Andrea Lentz	✔
	Deborah Archie	✔		Mary Beth Parisi	
	Sol Bermann	✔		John Runion	
	John Blair	✔		Mark Schmidbauer	✔
	Galen Bock			Karen Shaffer	
	Kevin Callaghan	✔		Martin Susec	
	Tamar Chute			Pari Swift	✔
	Judy Cobb	✔		Carol Thomas	✔
	Carol Crofut	✔		Dino Tsiboruris	✔
	Barbara Floyd	✔		Carol Volle	
	Mary Ellen Forrester			Daryl Weir	✔
	Rai Goerler	✔		Richard Whitehouse	✔
	Yvonne Harris	✔		Jane Wildermuth	✔
	David Landsbergen	✔		Judith Wise	
	David Larson	✔		Tony Yankus	
Alternates:	Jim Mendel	for Mary Beth Parisi			✔
GUESTS:					
Rich Hite					

I. Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 by Charlie Arp, State Archivist. Committee members introduced themselves to the group.

II. ERC Mission Statement

After some discussion, the current mission statement was changed in the following manner:

"The goal of the Electronic Records Committee (ERC) is to draft model policies, recommendations, and guidelines for the creation, maintenance, long term preservation of and access to electronic records created by Ohio's state and local governments."

It was suggested that the more members may need to be added to the ERC to reflect the addition of local governments.

III. Membership

Arp recently received an ERC membership application from a vendor prompting him to ask the Committee to consider whether opening membership up to vendors would be beneficial or detrimental to the Committee. A majority of the Committee agreed that while vendor input and expertise could be important at times, vendors as committee members was not favored for the following reasons including:

- A vote by a vendor in favor of a policy could taint the policy by appearing to push the vendor's agenda
- Use of meeting time to promote product
- Push for platform meeting vendor's agenda

The membership committee was assigned the task of devising a "non-voting" member status for vendors.

Arp also agreed to research whether ERC meetings fall under the Open Meetings Act of the Ohio Revised Code.

IV. Report on Web-site Statistics

Swift reported on ERC website statistics for the 2002 calendar year. Included in the report were statistics for the ERC Homepage, all guidelines/final documents, and any subcommittee that was active during 2002. The statistics remained similar to those of 2001. The ERC Homepage is estimated to have had over 10,000 hits in 2002.

V. Survey on Effectiveness of ERC Publications

In an attempt to determine how effective the ERC and its guidelines have been in Ohio, David Larson proposed surveying 25 Executive Branch agencies about their electronic records management practices. A draft of the survey was passed out at the meeting and members were ask to email Arp with their comments on the proposed questions. Issues brought up during the meeting included:

- What positions within the agencies will be surveyed?
- Will there be "success" be pre-defined? Are there certain items that we want to see an impact on?
- Should a survey be put on the website?
- Can the results be compared to retention schedules created before and after the implementation of the guidelines?
- Are Information Technology staff aware of the ERC and the connection between electronic information and records?
- How practical are the guidelines? Can they be implemented?
- Should a subcommittee be formed to analyze the survey results and devise other ways of garnishing more complete information?

VI. Report on the National Science Foundation Grant

The Ohio Historical Society, along with the Ohio Supercomputer Center and the Technology Policy Group at the Fisher College of Business submitted a grant proposal titled "A Systematic Approach to Defining Public electronic Records of Enduring Historical Value" to the National Science Foundation in November 2002. The grant asks for $758,000 over two years to create a dataset to estimate the costs of archiving electronic records. The project would do this by:

1. Surveying and appraising electronic records from Ohio government agencies
2. Create a decision-making matrix to determine which electronic records must be maintained in electronic formats
3. Develop guidelines on how to create and maintain electronic records
4. Forecast the aggregate costs of preserving and maintaining electronic records

VII. Report on the Imaging Sub-committee

Schmidbauer reported that the Digital Imaging Guidelines needed to be updated to reflect changes in technology. The Imaging Revision Sub-committee will be making more procedural changes to the Digital Imaging Guidelines, rather than technical changes. The original recommendations were divided up among the sub-committee members to make the initial changes. The goal for those drafts was 9 January 2003. Once the draft is compiled, it will be emailed to committee members to review and comment on until 15 February 2003. At the 11 March 2003 meeting, the draft will be finalized and voted on by the sub-committee. The document should be ready for ERC approval for the 26 June 2003 meeting.

VIII. Report on State IT Security Policy Development

Alt reported that on 5 December 2002, the Department of Administrative Services, pursuant to §125.021 of the Ohio Revised Code, issued six new Information Technology Security Policies. A working group of twelve agencies along with security experts are currently working on a second set of policies to be published later in 2003.

IX. Modification of the Ohio Trustworthy Information Systems Handbook

Arp proposed six areas of modification to the Ohio TIS. The first area of modification is to Section 7 "How Important is you Information?" A risk analysis will be added. At the end of each of the five criteria sections, the TIS will list criteria for low, medium, and high threat records or systems based on the afore mentioned risk analysis.

A vote was taken with all in favor of the modifications. Arp will send the changes to the ERC listserv when it is complete.

X. **Report on Michigan/San Diego Super Computer Center NHPRC Grant and the Minnesota/NHPRC Electronic Records Grant Agenda Meeting**

The Michigan Department of History, Arts and Libraries is collaborating on a project with the San Diego Super Computer Center to develop and test a model for preserving the records in Michigan's Records Management Application (RMA). The groups are working to isolate the functionality required in the communication between the RMA and the preservation model in order to ensure that records stored in the RMA are accessible as long as they are needed, even as software becomes obsolete.

The Minnesota Historical Society is working with NHPRC to improve the electronic records grant program by putting an emphasis on educating archivists and records managers so the electronic records programs can prosper. They are looking into modifying NHPRC's grant questions as well as requiring institutions to report on grant activities.

XI. **Closing**

Suggestions were taken for future sub-committee projects. The two suggestions were revising the Email Guidelines and looking at issues involving public records created using XML.

Arp will send committee members a list of possible dates for the June 2003 ERC meeting.