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**ISO23081 SYTEMATIC REVIEW.**

**France.**

**Attached document A**

France would like to take advantage of the opportunity of this systematic review to put this standard in revision and above all to include a minimal MD set in it .

Indeed, SC11 and WG1 had decided to wait for the end of the revision of ISO15489 Part 1, which is completed.

The RM experts authors of the international White paper published in 2013 <http://www.bivi.fonctions-documentaires.afnor.org/livres-blancs/livre-blanc-n-4-iso-30300-30301-metadonnees-pour-les-documents-d-activite.-principes-directeurs-vue-conceptuelle-et-modalites>

showing the difficulties to implement the actual ISO23081, were already calling for revision.

Some European countries (except EC, UK. ) , and specially France, do not have any national standard for RMMD , so the community of users and the software vendors demand it

Furthermore ISOTCSC11 is encouraged to produce such a set by the ISO TC171.

**Why we need to review 23081**

the current FDIS 15489 encompasses a definition of metadata

metadata for records are structured or semi-structured information, which enables the creation, management, and use of records through time and within and across domains

( former definition in ISO15489-1 2001 was “ data describing context, content and structure of records and their management through time »)

ISO 23081 acts as a focus on metadata for records management, with a part 1 for principles and a part 2 for implementation.

15489 is on the verge of being adopted with a complete new version of its content, and with a focus on the importance of metadata.

FDIS 15489 specifies a list of 6 classes of metadata in part 8.3, but in France we observe a strong lack of understanding by service providers and stakeholders owing to numerous cross-references throughout the document, Those same providers asked in National committee to specify a minimal metadata set for records management products.

As 23081 is now in systematic review, it seems adequate to work on the evolution of this product in coherence with 15489's main improvements.

 In this intention, many arguments could be risen :

 good governance of metadata is crucial : in a world of digital-based documents , good governance rests on good appraisal of information, good appraisal rests on high-level quality information, high-level quality information rests on a performant set of metadata. Informations correctly identified by a relevant metadata set or scheme is the only is the only possible way to comply with transparency and traceability requirements, and, in a world of perpetual information exchanges between systems, interoperability requirements.

We already know the risks of not creating and implementing a records management metadata policy : loss of information, loss of comprehensiveness of context, and loss of characteristics of records (reliability, authenticity, etc...)

But we also know what dangers we are facing by not having defined a minimal set of metadata :

- first, for the continuity and completeness of ISO records management products, the risk of another technical committee seizing the question and impose a minimal set, as it is already the situation in France.

- Second, for the comprehensiveness of ISO records management products, the risk of creating, and using sets defined only  by immediate needs and business specifics without encompassing all the business needs, or compliant to information lifecycle. We do need to have a consensus on a minimal set or scheme to bring fixity and stability to metadata syntax and semantic, and therefore clearly define our professional requirements to various communities working with or around records management.

All those reasons are potential threats to our aim to define better systems, qualified systems, and could be potentially harmful for the client of ISO Records management products, and do not deserve our purpose.

**So we propose to vote for a revision of 23081, and work whithin the WG1 for the definition of a minimal set of metadata.**

A working group was set up by AFNOR and the French Archivists Association (AAF) to work on a RMMD schema project. They are conducting a study on different international or national sets of MD standards already published (Australian RKMDS, MD sets of UK, Quebec, UN, EC ...) and those used by RM solutions developed or marketed in France, Luxembourg, Switzerland and Quebec.

This study (still in progress) will be made available to WG1 members before Wellington meeting as a basis for an international work.