InterPARES Trust Project
Research Report

Title:	EU36 - Archival Appraisal, Retention Schedules and Metadata in Web Sites - The Case Study of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Israel
Status:	Final Report
Version:	Final
Date submitted:	November 20, 2017
Last reviewed:	
Author:	InterPARES Trust Project
Writer(s):	Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll& Assaf Tractinsky
Research domain:	Control
URL:	

Document Control

Version history			
Version	Date	By	Version notes
Final	November 20, 2017	SS-K, AT	

Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll PhD, Senior Lecturer
Department of Information Science
Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan
ISRAEL

Assaf Tractinsky PhD
Knowledge Manager
Israel State Archives
Jerusalem
ISRAEL

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In the previous stages we examined the subject of appraising the material of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its website, and the types of documentation found on the site. We found that most of the types of documentation on the site can be defined as publicity-informative material, and a small amount as administrative. As mentioned in previous parts of our research[1], the character of the retention schedules appearing in the regulations and instructions of the Archives Law of the State of Israel (1955) indicate that they are intended to apply to all the administrative functions and processes of a specific government body. Therefore, the administrative records presented on the site for the purpose of providing a service to the public are also subject to those same regulations and instructions. However, due to the special nature of websites in general, and that of the research subject in particular – characteristics we related to in previous chapters – special appraisals of them are required. [2]And, indeed, we did not find a match between the publicity - informative material and the retention schedules of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Due to the great differences between the sections on the website[3], it was decided that the appraisals and disposition would be performed at the section level and not at the level of the entire website. In addition, it would not be performed at the level of single documents, because the small differences in the characters and contents of documents in a specific section does not justify going down to that level. The section level is equal to that of a folder in the computer. In addition, the behavior of users on the website was examined. We defined that a statistical analysis of user behavior on the internet, and their geographical location can serve as an additional category to assessment of websites; not exclusively, but together with additional categories[4].

At the present stage of the research we are examining the basic fields of metadata required for appraisal and disposition of the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the processes required to perform them. From a study of the main regulations and sites of several archives in the world we found that other than in the DOD regulations, and the instructions and procedures for creating metadata for managing records on the

---

[1] Silvia Shenkolewski-Kroll & Assaf Tractinsky, (2015). EU01-Research on retention and disposition processes in an internet website of the Government of Israel: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs case study. p. 21 -27

[2] Ibid, pp. 3-4

[3] Ibid, p. 31

[4] Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll, Assaf Tractinsky, (2016), EU25- Research on Users of the English Website of the Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a Criterion for Appraising Records - final report. pp. 14-16.(EU25, Final report)

websites of the Canadian government, there are no specific references to metadata fields on websites. [5]

Since the definition of metadata for the entire life cycle of website records is outside the boundaries of this research, it was decided that the research would concentrate on the following stages only: from the stage of appraisal up to the stage of transfer of records in accordance with the appraisal decision. The treatment was performed both on the process and its metadata. It should be mentioned that these records arrive at these stages with metadata for managing content and records management.

With regard to the process, InterPARES 2 - which deals with appraisal and disposition – was considered, but it does not deal with retention schedules in practice[6]. Therefore, the process of setting retention schedules was taken from the Archives Law of the State of Israel and/or the procedures of the National State Archives.

2. Appraisal of Material according to InterPARES 2

There are two aspects to the process of appraising digital records, which include the technological aspect and forms of the document, and the content aspect.

The InterPARES 2 model of preserving material is a diplomatics-technological model, which also includes aspects of diplomatics and technological aspects that support the ability to preserve records. Although the process does not include the appraisal of content, it includes additional aspects that are important to appraising digital records. The research indicates eight central aspects of the appraisal process[7].

1. The earliest possible appraisal of the material.
   Due to the technological difficulties related to the preservation of digital records that are designated for long-term preservation, their appraisal should be done as early as possible, in order to track the various technological changes.
2. Identification of the creators of the material.

---

[5] http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=18909

Two additional standards were used by us to create metadata for records management. They were adapted for our website requirements from two sources: British government, Cabinet Office, e-Government Unit, e-Government Metadata Standard, Version 3.1 29 August 2006. http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/information-management/egms-metadata-standard.pdf (e-GMS); and the Australian government, Australian Government Recordkeeping Metadata Standard (AGRkMS) Version 2.2 June 2015. http://www.naa.gov.au/Images/AGRkMS-Version-2.2-June-2015_tcm16-93990.pdf

[6] Y. Hackett, PRESERVER GUIDELINES Preserving Digital Records: Guidelines for Organizations, Appendix 21. In (Luciana Duranti and Randy Preston Editors) International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) 2: Experiential, Interactive and Dynamic Records Published by Associazione Nazionale Archivistica Italiana Padova, Italy 2008. pp. 703 – 707. http://www.interpares.org/ip2/book.cfm

[7] Ibid.

In cases where it is known that there are many creators or several storage locations of those same record copies, they must be located in order to appraise the preservation options. For example, information sources that appear on a website may be found on a distant storage site, outside of the site owner's control. For instance, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' site contains links to documents that are located on a film site saved on YouTube

3. Assessment of authenticity.
   Authenticity assessment also existed in the traditional appraisal process.

   3.1 At the first stage the continuity of the archival custody was examined, from the creation of the records and till their transfer to the archive.
   3.2 In addition, their authenticity was examined, based on the knowledge of the archivist of everything related to the creator's procedures of record management.
   3.3 A comparison with other records that were transferred by the creator from his system of records management to another place.
   3.4 Comparisons were made with the creator's records that are located outside the system of records management, in order to ensure the identity and integrity of the records.

4. Documentation of the assessment of authenticity.
   The appraisal report should document the controls put in place by the creator to guarantee the identity and integrity of the records and thus the presumption of their authenticity. These controls include each of the benchmark requirements supporting the presumption of authenticity. Briefly, these include:

   4.1 Expression of Record Attributes and Linkage to Record (e.g., identity and integrity metadata)
   4.2 Access Privileges
   4.3 Protective Procedures against Loss and Corruption of Records
   4.4 Protective Procedures against Media Deterioration and Technological Change
   4.5 Establishment of Documentary Forms
   4.6 Authentication of Records
   4.7 Identification of Authoritative Record
   4.8 Removal and Transfer of Relevant Documentation[8]

5. Control of records that were identified as valuable for long-term retention.
   Once the records designated for long-term preservation have been identified, they must be audited and controlled, in order to examine whether the records have not been changed; and if they have, to check that the changes did not alter

---

[8] Ibid, p. 706

their attributes and characteristics, value, authenticity or their feasibility for preservation of the material.

6. Updating the appraisal.
   When tests are conducted on records in the creator entity, it is possible to gather information that may lead to updating the appraisal or re-appraising the records. For example, following administrative changes in the organization, a system that did not contain records for permanent preservation will now contain such records.

7. Identification of the digital components.
   Components of digital records may be stored in various locations in the computer's system; therefore, it is important to find them and the metadata related to them, in order to transfer all the parts of the record to the archive, or other storage space.

8. Determination of the possibility of preservation.
   Although not part of the assessment of the value of the records, the appraisal process must be completed by a careful investigation of the technical requirements for preservation[9].

3. Determining Retention Schedules in Israel

With regard to the administrative process of determining retention schedules for website records, it should not be much different from that used for regular records. The people or position-holders participating in the process do not have to be others than those that participate in appraisal procedures of office systems; [10] that is, the record creators, the record manages, technical personnel, legal personnel and archivists. In addition, the various types of publicity - informative records – in their essence – are no different than those created by special records; for example, audio-visual records. The various stages we propose are:

1. The creator entity – i.e., those responsible for the site, discuss specific issues by section[11].
   The web-master and those responsible for presenting the raw material from which the pages of a specific section were created, will take into consideration the parameters appropriate to the type of material, and will determine temporary proposals for retention schedules and the procedures for their execution.

---

[9] Ibid, p. 707
[10] Prime Minister Office, State Archives, How to Destruct Archival Material, 1997 (Hebrew). p. 9 (How to destruct)
[11] Ibid.

Following are several parameters that may be appropriate for publicity-informative sections:

- An examination of the replacement of pages in the section, and the reason for their replacement.
- Standard material that repeats itself, determining a time period (once a month, every two weeks, etc.) samples of which are left on the site permanently;
- Determining topics appropriate for permanent preservation due to their importance (historically, politically, one-time cases, wars, etc.).
- The issue of users and their countries of origin[12].

2. A discussion within the ministry to develop a position and the formulation of a concrete proposal.

   The next forum within the ministry is a committee of representatives of those in charge of the site and those responsible for the subject, as determined above; together with the person responsible for records management, the legal advisor to the ministry or his representative; as well as any additional party relevant to the topic. The committee's function is to develop a final stand by the ministry, according to rules appropriate to websites (including metadata and explanations as needed). All that, if the State Archives have not yet determined rules for this type of material, or determined that there is no need at all for special rules.

3. Presentation of the request to determine retention schedules to the State Archives.

   Examination of the request by those responsible for the subject at the State Archives. Acceptance and inclusion on the agenda for discussion by the Committee for Appraisal of Archival Material, or returning it to the senders by those dealing with it, for technical or procedural reasons. Approval after receiving explanations or revisions by the ministry.

4. A discussion in the Committee for Appraisal of Archival Material, and determining the retention schedule.

   This is a permanent committee, composed of representatives of the State Archives, the legal advisor of the Prime Minister's Office, the Ministry of Finance, the State Comptroller, the Ministry of the Interior; and ad-hoc representatives from the ministries or other parties requesting an appraisal of their records. [13]
   The committee's decisions, whether according to the original request or after changes have been made, are forwarded for the remainder of the process for

---

[12] Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll, Assaf Tractinsky, (2016), EU25- Research on Users of the English Website of the Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a Criterion for Appraising Records. Interim report. pp. 7-17. (EU25, Interim report) See also in the final report pp. 6-16

[13] How to Destruct?, 1997 (Hebrew). p.8

approval by the Higher Archives Council[14]; and then for addition to the regulations and/or the legal instructions[15] of the Archives Law.

5. The process of adding a regulation or instruction to the existing Archives Law. See Paragraph d) above.

6. Procedures for maintenance until the destruction is performed.
7. Procedures for transferring parts designated for permanent preservation to the State Archives.

We did not deal with the processes of 6 and 7 because they were outside of our research boundaries.

4. The Process of Disposition of Records

The process includes the following stages:

1. Feeding of appraisal data into the records management system
   After completing the appraisal process of a group of records in the section, the Records Manager in the ministry incorporates the decisions of the material appraisal in the records management system. The decisions include the legal and administrative authority for the disposition decision, the assignment of the group of records, the retention schedule and the execution of the disposition.
2. The retention schedule in accordance with the Archives Law.
   Retention of the material for the period determined in accordance with the appraisal decisions appearing in the Archives Law.
3. Execution of disposition.
   Whether that means destruction, transfer to the archive or to another system.

5. Methodology of Determining Metadata Fields

The research for determining metadata fields was based on an examination of three standards of records management:

---

[14] The council was established based on the Archives Law 1955. Members of the council are representatives of government ministries, archives, cultural institutions and experts. Its main roles are to recommend to the government the appointment of the State Archivist, and to certify the notices of destruction of material of government ministries. The Archives Law, 5717 – 1955 and Regulation Sections 2, 3 and 13. (Hebrew). http://www.archives.gov.il/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/%D7%97%D7%95%D7%A7-%D7%94%D7%A8%D7%90%D7%9B%D7%99%D7%95%D7%A0%D7%99%D7%9D-1955.pdf

[15] Note: It should be presumed that the retention schedules of sections on the website will enter the Archives Law as instructions, not as regulations; especially when it comes to material that is not vital, and from the aspect of the administrative process is easier to deal with. For example, there is no need to publish instructions in the official Law Gazette, with the signature of the Prime Minister.

1. The high-level guide for records management of the ICA (International Council on Archives)[16]
2. The DOD (5015.02) (the American Department of Defense)[17]
3. The MoReq (Modular Requirements for Records Systems 2010)[18] of the DLM (Document Lifecycle Management) Forum[19].

The fourth element is the Rogers and Tennis metadata scheme research, which supplies data for determining the authenticity of records at the document level. This project is part of InterPARES 3 [20].

The Guidelines and Functional Requirements for Records in Electronic Offices is the second module of a set of three guides for managing records published by the ICA in 2008. The guide includes mandate and optional requirements in a general manner, without going into in-depth details of the metadata for managing records in electronic offices[21]. It is based on the standard of ISO 15489 – 1, Information and Documentation – Records Management – Part 1: General; and on two metadata standards: ISO 23081 – 1: 2006 and ISO/TS 23081-2:2007[22].

DOD 5015.2 is a standard of the program for managing records of the American Ministry of Defense from 2007, which provides a guide and processes for managing records in the Ministry of Defense. It also defines the basic functional requirements for developing applications for managing records. This standard was accepted by NARA (National Archives and Records Administration) as the standard for managing records, and government institutions in the United States are obligated to work according to it. This standard is the only one of the standards reviewed here that also includes metadata for the web, in chapter C2.2.5.1 and in Table C2.T5. The information in the standard that is

---

[16] ICA, Principles and functional requirements for records in electronic office environments, Module 2 Guidelines and functional requirements for records in electronic office environments, 2008 (ICA Module 2). https://www.ica.org/en/ica-tools

[17] Department of Defense, Electronic Records Management Software Applications Design Criteria Standard (2007). DoD 5015.02-STD. http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodm/501502std.pdf

[18] DLM Forum Foundation, Modular Requirements for Records Systems, MoReq 2010, Core Services & Plug-in Modules, Volume 1.   http://www.moreq.info/

[19] Document Lifecycle Management Forum http://www.dlmforum.eu/index.php/about-us/our-history

[20] Corinne Rogers & Joseph T. Tennis, (2016) General Study 15 – Application Profile for Authenticity Metadata: General Study Report, http://www.interpares.org/ip3/display_file.cfm?doc= ip3_canada_gs15_final_report.pdf. Last Revised: February 2016

[21] (ICA Module 2), p. 26

[22] Ibid. In the ICA guide, we will concentrate on Chapter 3.6 - Retention and disposal, and the following two sub-chapters: 3.6.1 - Disposition authorities and 3.6.2 – Migration, export and destruction. In accordance with the needs of this research, in Chapter 3.6.1 we will concentrate on the following parts: Establishing disposition authorities, Applying disposition authorities, Executing disposition authorities, Documenting disposition actions and Reviewing disposition. In the second chapter, 3.6.2, we will only concentrate on the part of destruction.

linked to web records concentrates on a number of aspects, most of which are related to preparations for transferring material to the archive. They include the names of the site and the folders, as well as technological aspects of websites, such as: types of web content management systems, web applications and method and date of the capture of the site.

The MoReq 2010 is a specification for records management that was issued by the DLM Forum, which describes "modular requirements for record systems". The last edition of the standard is from 2010, and it was released a year later, in 2011. The purpose of the specification is to provide an array of simple, comprehensive requirements for a record system. The goal is that the records system will be adopted and applied to information activities by various businesses, industrial sectors and organizations of various types[23]. The specification is suitable for various sectors due to the fact that it is constructed from several core services that are defined equally for all, which can constitute a part of various records systems. In addition, the specification is modular, so that the various services can be integrated in different designated systems which lack knowledge about records systems[24].

In the specification we will concentrate on one service that interests us, disposal scheduling service 8[25]. The service deals with the disposition process of the records in the records management system, which can occur for the following reasons: transfer to the archive for permanent preservation, transfer to another system or destruction. The specification adopts the attitude that there is no possibility to delete records from the system without a disposition plan. In addition, the records are not completely deleted. Despite the fact that the content and part of the metadata of the record are deleted[26], the rest of the remaining metadata indicate that the record existed and was disposed of in an appropriate manner by a disposition plan[27]. In any case, this procedure of disposition is non-reversible from the moment it is executed.

5.1 Summary of the Methodology

The standards surveyed above are common in the field of records management, and present requirements of metadata in accordance with their needs. The research conducted by Rogers and Tennis under InterPARES 3 expands the metadata fields and presents those required to reinforce the presumption of authenticity of the records according to the InterPARES model. We will use two sub-sections of their research in our

---

[23] http://www.moreq.info/

[24] Ibid.

[25] MoReq 2010 contains an additional service, called Disposal holding service, which is not applied in Israel; therefore, we will not refer to it in this research.

[26] DLM-Forum, MoReq2010®, Core Services & Plug-in Modules. P.115

[27] Ibid.

project: Managing Records in a Record–making System (A2) and Managing Records in a Recordkeeping System (A3), which relate directly to this phase of our work[28].

In all these standards the test was performed on the parts related to appraisal and disposition. The difficulty in comparing these documents stems from the fact that each one of them details the functional requirements at different levels, emphasizes certain components and calls identical or almost identical components by different names. Of the standards for records management the ICA is the most general; the DOD is at the intermediate level; and the MoReq 2010, which a standard for application in systems, is the most detailed.

If we look at processes found in all the standards, we find that they include determining the disposition authority, executing the function of disposition in accordance with appraisal and retention schedules, destruction, additional examination and transfer. The InterPARES structure relates more to the destruction processes and the transfer of records. In addition, every group of records that received appraisal definitions has a profile of data that identify it and accompany it during the entire process. The names given to the components in each of the methods may be different. Thus, MoReq 2010 calls the authority for disposition decisions as 'Mandate', and others call it 'Disposition Authority'. That is also the case with the name for the action which begins the retention schedule; MoReq 2010 calls it the 'Retention Trigger Code', the ICA calls it the 'disposition trigger', and the DOD call it the 'Cut off'.

In conclusion, all the standards and the InterPARES scheme refer in different amounts of detail to all the processes in the research of appraisal, disposition and destruction. MoReq 2010 differs in an essential matter, in that it emphasizes that in the destruction process metadata of the record is preserved, even if the record is destructed.

6. Metadata Fields

In this part we will present the basic fields of the website and the sections it contains, including the appraisal and disposition. On the Ministry of Foreign Affairs site there was only one field of metadata created at the section level – the section name. [29] Since on the original site there were few metadata values, and not all of them suit the requirements, according to the research and our planning[30], most of the fields were taken from the record level and standards for records management, and adapted to the section level; this because our main intention is to determine appraisal and disposition, that do not exist in the original metadata of the site[31].

---

[28] See in Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll & Assaf Tractinsky (2017), EU36 Archival Appraisal, Retention Schedules and Metadata in Web Sites - The Case Study of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Israel.
[29] Ibid. pp.11-12, and 18-19.
[30] We reached 24 elements that can answer the requirements we determined.
[31] With regard to the metadata sources, see p. 5 above.

The table is constructed from four columns: the furthest left presents the name of the metadata element; the second presents a description of the element; and the third is called 'Source', and it contains the standards from which the elements were taken. The fourth column presents, if there were any, similar or identical fields that already existed on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs website.

The table presents, at first, general metadata features of the site that are required for a technological appraisal. They define the digital platform used on the site; what software and hardware are used by those operating the site and the date they were installed; as well as any changes of the platform and the dates of the changes. In addition to the software and hardware that operate the site, information is needed on the operating program of its content. Additional information listed in the standard is the structure of the website regarding its content, and whether there were any changes in the site. Further types of information are the website address, its name and the method whereby the parts of the site were harvested. After that a cluster of metadata fields appears, of the cycle of life of the folder/section, which includes a minimum of the metadata that was collected in the folder for record management requirements, and at the end, the table presents the metadata of appraisal and disposition. It should be noted that we have added three new elements that did not exist in any other standard[32].

Table of Metadata Elements of Website and Section

	Metadata Element	Description	Source	Original Metadata of Ministry of Foreign Affairs Site
1	Web platform	Include the specific software applications and where available intended browser applications and versions. Every time the platform is changed, it must be noted.	DOD[33] (C2.T5.8), AUS[34] (Format 19, 19.3 Creating Application Name , 19.4 Creating Application Version), COP[35] (A.2.3.2)	

---

[32] See explanations in the table.

[33] Department of Defense, Electronic Records Management Software Applications Design Criteria Standard (2007). DoD 5015.02-STD

[34] http://www.naa.gov.au/information-management/digital-transition-and-digital-continuity/information-is-interoperable/metadata/index.aspx

[35] Corinne Rogers and Joseph T. Tennis, General Study 15 – Application Profile for Authenticity Metadata: General Study Report. http://www.interpares.org/ip3/display_file.cfm?doc= ip3_canada_gs15_final_report.pdf. Last Revised: February 2016

	Metadata Element	Description	Source	Original Metadata of Ministry of Foreign Affairs Site
2	Web platform Date	Date of web platform installation. When a new web platform is installed, it will be necessary to document the date of the new installation.	New	
3	Web site name	Title of the website from the main entry. page	DOD (C2.T5.9.)	
4	Web site uniform resource locator?	Include the filename of the starting page of the transferred Content; i.e., the address of the section.	DOD (C2.T5.10)	
5	Content management system	Application used to manage files on the web.	DOD (C2.T5.25.)	
6	Web content structure change	Change in the web content structure. The change may include change in contents between the sections, closing a section, and transferring the section from place to place on the file tree.	New	
7	Modified	Date on which the section was changed – changes in the section, such as addition or deletion of records. Date on which the resource was changed.	Canada (WCMS[36])	Called 'Scheduling end date' on the site.
8	Creator	Creator of Section	Canada[37] (RMR (Agent),DCM) UK[38]	

---

[36] Canada, Appendix D: Web Content Management System (WCMS), http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=18909

	Metadata Element	Description	Source	Original Metadata of Ministry of Foreign Affairs Site
			(2.7),COP (A.2.2.4), AUS (Agent)	
9	Covering dates	The dates of the oldest and most recent items in a collection, series or folder	ICA terminology	Called 'GovXEventDate' on the site.
10	Chronological date	Date of creation of the file in a digital system. Chronological date (and possibly time) of compilation and capture (ICA terminology)	COP (A.2.2) Capturing documents made or received by the creator.	
11	Title	Title of the section. Name of the section.	Canada (WMCS) UK (2.24), AUS (NAME) 3)	Called 'Name of folder' on the site.
12	Issued	Date of formal issuance of the section.	Canada (WMCS) UK (2.8)	Called 'Scheduling start date' on the site.
13	Description	A free-text description of the section	UK (2.9), AUS (5)	Called 'GovXContentSection' on the site.
14	Registration identifier	A unique identifier for the section	Canada (RMR), UK (2.13),COP (A.2.2.2) AUS (2)	
15	Aggregation	The section's level or position in a hierarchy. Each of the entities classes identified in ISO 23081-1:2006 (i.e. record, agent, mandate, business, records management business) exist	Canada (RMR), COP (A.2.2.3), UK (2.3)	

37 Canada, Appendix B: Recordkeeping Metadata Requirements. http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=18909

38 Cabinet Office, e-Government Unit, e-Government Metadata Standard, Version 3.1 29 August 2006, http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/information-management/egms-metadata-standard.pdf (e-GMS)

	Metadata Element	Description	Source	Original Metadata of Ministry of Foreign Affairs Site
		at different layers of aggregation. For example, within the entity "agent", an individual, a work unit, a department/division/branch or the organization as a whole can be described. Within the entity class "record", an item, a folder, a file, a series, etc. can be described. Each of these layers is referred to as an aggregation.		
16	Classification system	Information on classification of the entity according to a business or functional classification plan.	Canada (RMR), COP (A.2.2.4)	
17	Integrity	Information that indicates that the entity and its metadata remained in their entirety from the moment of their creation.	Canada(RMR), AUS (22)	
18	Link to file outside the system	Information on links to files outside the system.	New	The site contains a link to a picture document – GovXDescriptionImg, and a link to a film file – GovXMainTitle
19	Disposition authority (also Disposal authority)	A formal instrument that defines the retention periods and consequent disposition actions authorized for classes of records described in the authority.	ICA (148, 154), MoReq (Mandate (M14.4.51)), DOD (C2.T1.5.)	

	Metadata Element	Description	Source	Original Metadata of Ministry of Foreign Affairs Site
20	Disposition action	The action to be taken when a disposition date occurs (e.g., interim transfer, accession, or destroy).(DOD)	ICA (152), DOD (C2.T1.4.), MoReq 2010 (M14.4.18)	
21	Retention trigger	The point from which the disposition action is calculated. This can be a date on which action is completed or a date on which an event occurs (ICA)	MoReq 2010 (M14.4.94) , ICA (85)	
22	Retention period	The length of time after the disposition trigger that a record must be maintained and accessible. At the expiration of the retention period, a record may be subject to a disposition action. (ICA)	ICA (153), DOD (C2.2.2.7), MoReq 2010 (M14.4.90)	
23	Disposition Action Date?	The fixed date on which the records in a file become due for final disposition.(DOD)	MoReq 2010 , DOD	
24	Review	A process in which the retention schedule is changed. In Israel the retention process is changed when the new retention schedules are entered into the Archives Law.	ICA (165)	

7. <u>Summary and Conclusions EU 036</u>

In the third and final stage of our research we discussed topics related to appraisal, determining retention schedules, disposition and defining the metadata related to all those stages; without considering everything that relates to disposition and deposit in practice. Everything is adapted to a test case we dealt with in the three stages of the research (EU01, EU25, EU36) on the English website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The main conclusion, which is the basis for reaching additional conclusions, is to use the Section as the unit upon which the rest of the results are constructed. The reasons for that are, on the one hand, the difference between the sections justify this method, as opposed to the accepted method of 'harvesting' the entire site[39]. On the other hand, we reached the conclusion that we should not go down to the level of single records, which would needlessly complicate the topic of appraisal; especially when the records are of an publicity - informative nature. In the processes related to appraisal and determining retention schedules, the classic parameters (administrative, judicial, research and social) should be taken into account; as well as in the topic of the users[40], and the phenomena related to the characteristics and content of records that constitute the section (events, replacement, topics, technological changes, etc.)[41]. With regard to the appraisal process itself, and determining retention schedules, it is not different from common practice in the management of conventional and digital records that are related to the administrative-functional aspect of the ministry. There are additional aspects that must be taken into consideration, along with the classic appraisal process, and they are an examination of the possibility of preservation of the records, and preserving their authenticity.

As for the metadata that accompanies the entire process that was examined, we found that there is almost no reference in the standards and procedures common in the world to the metadata of websites in general, and their appraisal. There is also no reference to the level of sections; therefore, metadata that was designated to the level of records was adapted to the level of sections. The sources of this metadata are standards and procedures from various organizations and countries (see above table), and an addition of three new items, of our own choosing. At this stage, it would be appropriate to run the entire system on two sections and examine its effectiveness in practice; and update or change it in accordance with the results.

---

[39] See in: EU25, Interim report p.3

[40] See in: EU25, Interim report and EU25, Final report.

[41] See in: EU25, Final report, p.15.