

Meeting Summary
AIIM Standards Committee C22
April 8, 2003
Javits Convention Center, New York City

1. The meeting started at 10:15 am, Dan Schneider, committee Chairperson, presiding. Participants for all or portions of the meeting were John Breeden, Library of Virginia; Vigi Gurushanta, eVida Group; Bob Breslawski, Kodak; Mark Giguere, National Archives and Records Administration; Ann Dugan, ASRC Aerospace Corp.; Fred Grevin, NYC Dept. of Environmental Protection; Juris Kelley, Knowledge-in-Motion, LLC; Frank Lambert, Zantaz, Inc.; Herman Silbiger, Applicom; and Dan Schneider.
2. The revised agenda presented in document C22-2003-004 was adopted. It was noted that in the absence of a quorum, the meeting would not make formal decisions.
3. No corrections were offered to the summary of the March 7, 2002 meeting (document C22-2002-005).
4. No corrections were offered to the Annual Report for 2002 (document C22-2003-001). Mark Giguere asked about the status of the authentication activity described in that document. Dan Schneider replied that while no work has been performed on it to date, it remains a project proposal for the committee; and given its importance and centrality, it will have to be addressed in the revision/replacement of TR-31.

Initial Presentations, and Old Business

6. Dan Schneider briefed the attendees on the current status of projects/documents in ISO Technical Committee 171, Subcommittee 3 (TC171/SC3), noting that PDTR 15801 was revised by its U.K. proponents to accommodate the concerns C22 raised last year, and that the French proponents of PDTR 18509 had undertaken to recast that document into two separate documents in order to accommodate C22's concerns about it. Dan also alerted the attendees to the upcoming new work item proposal ballot for Bob Williams' draft report.
7. In connection with the discussion on TC171/SC3, Bob Breslawski explained the committee scope dispute between ISO TCs 171 and 46, specifically between their respective subcommittees 3 and 11. It seems to the U.S. (AIIM) participants in TC171 that TC46 is seeking sole authority over all information management subject-matter, such as the document handling good practices and retention guidance contained in PDTR 15801, 18509, the Williams' proposal, and the AIIM ARP-1 "Guidelines" report which the U.S. anticipates introducing into TC171/SC3. Bob noted that TC171 has been making efforts to negotiate the scope dispute with TC46, but that their lack of success means that the matter is likely to be resolved by the appropriate ISO authority board later this year, or in 2004.
8. Bob Breslawski briefed the attendees on the efforts of the project he is leading, "Digital Imaging Quality and Preservation (DIQP). He noted that the issue is the long-term preservation of images on media which has inherent degradation associated with age. His project seeks to develop guidance on strategies that enterprises can use to meet their long-term image retention requirements with an acceptable image quality preservation. Bob noted that the project would be meeting in the afternoon in the adjacent room, principally to hear a presentation on the topic by Charles Dollar.
9. Vigi Gurushanta briefed the attendees on the substance and status of the new e-Evidence Standard for Canada. (His slides had been distributed to the C22 list on April 2, in the e-mail message distributing also the revised meeting agenda.) Vigi noted that unlike the U.S. with its many state jurisdictions that follow different rules and standards, the far fewer provinces of Canada generally observe the same rules and standards as the national courts. Therefore, Vigi anticipates that the e-Evidence Standard will be observed throughout Canada. He noted also that because the standard will eventually comprise three parts, of which only one has been written, his drafting committee faces several more years of effort to complete the endeavor.
10. Before breaking for lunch, the attendees who were planning to return for the afternoon found that they shared

a desire to attend Charles Dollar's presentation to the DIQP project meeting. Accordingly, it was agreed to recess the C22 meeting until after Charles' presentation and its follow-up discussion in the DIQP meeting. Charles' presentation of his views on long-term preservation ran from about 1:30 to about 2:45 pm.

New Business

11. The C22 discussion on new work (the two agenda items under New Business) began at about 3:00 and continued to adjournment. Dan noted that a key decision would be whether to withdraw TR31 Part 1. He noted that TR31 Part 1 is up now for ANSI-required reaffirmation, revision, or withdrawal. A discussion among Dan, Bob Breslawski, and Betsy Fanning (who joined the meeting at this point) revealed that the committee had a 2-3 year grace period beyond the ANSI-required action date within which to reach a final decision on the action to be taken. Dan noted that the substance of TR31 Part 1 is the question of admissibility of electronic digital images, as contrasted with photographic (analog) images. Dan contended that because the question has been answered throughout the legal system, the issue is moot, and Part 1 is no longer relevant. The persons present at the discussion had not read Part 1 recently in its entirety and preferred to withhold a judgment on withdrawal. Accordingly, it was agreed that the new report (to be drafted as a white paper that could be transitioned to a Technical Report) would be developed as a separate document, at which time a decision could be made on whether to withdraw Part 1 in light of the new report.

12. In discussing the new report, Dan recommended that it seek to set forth our views of the legal electronic information evidentiary issues of the current decade - that it be an "issues" report. The strategies/solutions could be the subject of follow-up reports. Some participants felt that we should leave the door open to offering strategies in the issues report, and it was agreed that while the principal focus of our drafting efforts would be on issues, we would be open to including strategy proposals in the same report. It was agreed that Dan would undertake to get the drafting underway, and that others would join in as an ad hoc working group as the report starts taking shape.

13. The substantive issues discussion for the new report was wide-ranging. Fred Grevin noted that New York State had recently adopted rules for electronic signatures, joining several other states that have pursued such rules. Frank Lambert shared several observations about the evidentiary and regulatory rule compliance concerns he has been encountering in his discussions with large global financial industry enterprises. Among the evidentiary issues identified in the discussion were the amount and kind of authentication needed, the treatment of embedded hyperlinks, the handling of instant messaging, the handling of multimedia files, the handling of streaming audio and video, the handling of trade secret and intellectual property materials, the absence of server files in a peer-to-peer environment, the relationship between virus infections and spoliation, the relationship between metadata migration and spoliation, the appropriate treatment of spam materials, the impacts of new auditing rules being developed pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, the issues around devices and systems used for both business/enterprise/employer activities and for personal use, the appropriate record design strategies for workflow and collaborative environments, and, of course, the already-noted C22 issues of record boundaries, composition, technologies, and metadata.

Action Items for Follow-up

Dan will undertake to draft at least an outline of a new Technical Report on the legal e-evidence issues confronting enterprises today, especially in relation to electronic commerce and paperless internal business processes. Committee participants will be asked to contribute to the effort by writing about either issues or suggested strategies or both. An ad hoc working group will be pursued, with Dan acting as coordinator/editor for at least the start-up period.

Next Meeting

The next committee meeting will be at AIIM 2004, at the Javits Convention Center in New York City. It is possible that as work progresses on the new document, one or more working group meetings might take place before March 2004.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by motion, seconded, at 4:45 pm.