

# Follow-up to Information Management Audit

**July 2004**

**Report Clearance Steps**

Follow-up process initiated	September 2003
Report completed	March 2004
Follow-up report approved by Departmental Audit and Evaluation Committee	July 22, 2004

**Acronyms used in the report**

AEB	Audit and Evaluation Branch
DAEC	Departmental Audit and Evaluation Committee
EC	Environment Canada

## New Follow-up Process

As of the May 23, 2003, meeting of the Departmental Audit and Evaluation Committee (DAEC), a new approach to follow-ups is being taken. While the practice in the past had been for the Audit and Evaluation Branch (AEB) to conduct them, it is now the responsibility of the relevant program managers to conduct follow-ups to recommendations and proposed action plan resulting from audits or evaluations of their own programs. This information is provided in a table format presented in Appendix 1 of this report. The information provided by program managers has been reviewed by the AEB and a brief context is provided below.

## Context

This Follow-up of the Information Management Audit, approved by DAEC in May of 2001, has been initiated to determine the adequacy, effectiveness and timeliness of management action taken to implement the recommendations and management proposed actions made in the initial audit. Follow-ups are important, as they give senior management a crucial indicator as to the implementation rate of recommendations and adjustments made in relation to the management responses.

The initial audit identified five risks areas including: information of archival value were likely being destroyed therefore, EC was out of compliance with the National Archive Canada Act; EC may not be fully prepared to launch all services on time under Government-on-Line as planned; the lack of a coherent and comprehensive approach to IM Practices may be costing the department more than necessary; shortage of trained expert matter staff to advise all EC staff may increase some of the risks mentioned above; and the cost of a central technological solution may be higher than anticipated and yet not fulfil departmental expectations due to the decentralised nature of the department, if not adequately evaluated.

The report made three recommendations with emphasis on development of a structure to address some of the issues in the short term; the development of a communication plan for the department that is sustained to ensure that both current and future staff is informed; and the development of a business case before any decision regarding the new technology is made. A complete list of the recommendations and management response is provided in Appendix 1.

## Current Status

The initial audit made 3 recommendations with several sub-recommendations. Program managers agreed to the recommendations and provided an action plan to address each recommendation. This follow-up audit concluded that program managers have achieved most of the proposed goals except for the following:

Recommendation #1: Development of a retention and disposal schedule.

The response from the directorate does not provide assurance that the destruction of information having potential archival value is not happening. The directorate, however, expects to complete implementation in 2 to 4 years.

Recommendation #2: Development of a communication program.

Based on information provided, the IM directorate has initiated action and has indicated that the plan is to train about 3000 employees over the next two years. AEB is of the opinion that in order for EC staff to maximize benefits from the system, training must be sustained particularly with respect to newly hired staff.

Recommendation #3: Implementation of the EnSuite technology for the department.

The initial recommendation was the development of a business case prior to deciding on a system. The directorate did develop a business case and as a result, EnSuite was chosen. The directorate has indicated that the implementation of the EnSuite technology started in late 2003 will take 4 to 5 years.

Based on the responses provided by IM managers, AEB is of the opinion that there are still some elements of the IM that have not been fully addressed and therefore, represent some risks to the department. For example, an IM system that does not adequately protect and conserve valuable documents may be detrimental to EC in the long-run.

## Future Actions

The IM/IT directorate agrees with the findings of this follow-up. Based on action plan proposed by information management, the directorate has indicated implementation of the three outstanding issues over a period of 2 to 4 years.

In light of the high value information generated by EC and training requirement for staff to realize maximum use of the new system, and based on the proposed action plan, AEB therefore, recommends that the Committee on Managing Resources for Results (CMRR) oversees the implementation of the plan over the next few years. AEB will consider a full audit thereafter.

## Appendix 1

### Environment Canada

# FOLLOW-UP AUDIT OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (IM)

## - TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS -

Prepared by Director General  
Information Management and Technology Services  
Human Resources and Service Innovations  
Version 1 as of October 22, 2003

*Note: this document contains references to the Systems and Informatics Directorate (SID). SID was integrated into the Information Management and Information Technology Directorate (IM-ITD) in June 2002. IM-ITD is now responsible for the implementation of the recommendations contained in this follow-up audit*

APPENDIX 1  
PROGRAM RESPONSE:  
FOLLOW-UP TO AUDIT OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

<b>INFORMATION MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION 1 &amp; MANAGEMENT RESPONSE</b>			
<b>Addressed <input type="checkbox"/></b>		<b>Partially Addressed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></b>	<b>Not Addressed <input type="checkbox"/></b>
INITIAL CONTEXT & RECOMMENDATION	INITIAL MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	ACTIONS TAKEN TO DATE	ACTION PLAN
<p>In the shorter term, the Information Management Branch, with the help of regions, should develop the basic structures, documents and tools to provide guidance to employees. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>a common IM terminology, concepts and standards;</b></li> <li>• <b>the definition of the roles/responsibilities of the business lines, program managers and staff related to IM;</b></li> <li>• <b>the updating of the classification system;</b></li> <li>• <b>the development of a retention and disposal schedule;</b></li> <li>• <b>the development / update of departmental IM</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed action for common terminology, concepts and standards and a definition of roles and responsibilities:</b> The Information Management Branch (IMB), with the support of the Information Management Steering Committee (IMSC) and the Regional Directors of Finance and Administration, will develop a document to identify common terminology, concepts and standards. In the same vein, a document outlining all employees' responsibilities (from senior managers to managers to support staff) will be prepared. Those 2 documents should be developed in the context of an Information Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A departmental Information Management (IM) Framework to <b>define roles and responsibilities as well as accountability in each field of IM was developed.</b> It also <b>contains IM terminology, concepts and standards.</b></li> <li>• MAP approved original IM Framework</li> <li>• The IM Branch has merged with Systems and Informatics Directorate to become IM-IT Directorate, thus positioning IM within a global vision of information and technology management.</li> <li>• Participation in the development of the IM-IT Architecture.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information Management Framework is in its last implementation stage with the upcoming creation of an IMSC (Information Management Standing Committee) that will oversee the governance, strategic planning and development of IM in EC. Submitted to EGIC for approval in October 2003.</li> <li>• Best practices, standards, business rules, awareness, training and reference material are under final edit, prior to EnSuite implementation.</li> <li>• Currently performing an IM Capacity Assessment within EC in accordance with the MGI (Management</li> </ul>

<p><b>policies; and</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>the establishment of standards for data and information management technologies, in order to ensure compatibility and sharing of data and information.</b></li> </ul> <p>Once developed, these tools and guidance documents must be communicated to employees across the department.</p>	<p>Framework.</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b> Fall 2001 for the Common terminology and the definition of the roles and responsibilities. The definition of the roles and responsibilities should be presented to MAP later in the Fall.</p> <p><b>Proposed action for updating the classification system:</b> A new classification system based on functional processes should be put in place. National Archives have been approached to benefit from their experience. Given this is a fairly new concept, preparatory work to understand the system and its impact/feasibility within EC will be essential. IMB will work on a proposal to get external expertise to assist in the development of such a structure.</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b> Program Integrity funding will be required before</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Function Based File Plan <b>(FBC) has been developed for the MAP table</b> for inclusion in EnSuite in October 2003. Other tables will follow as further implementations take place. It includes a controlled vocabulary.</li> <li>The FBC will include a thesaurus for common terminology.</li> <li>A website has been developed to give all employees the opportunity to inventory their legacy information related to the Bloc Numeric Classification System. <b>(Currently on hold due to a lack of</b></li> </ul>	<p>of Government Information Policy).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of the FBC will span over the next 18 months or so. As EC's employees are provided with the EnSuite tools, their portion of the FBC will be developed. The maintenance of the FBC will be ensured by employees via the provided tool set. The national IM organizations will ensure that the integrity of the FBC is maintained.</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

	<p>setting up milestones.</p> <p><b>Proposed action for development of a retention and disposal schedule:</b> A business plan was prepared in the Fall of 1999 for which no funding was identified. The work was to be done over a period of 2 years. A second proposal to do the work internally over a longer period (6 years) has also been completed. This longer term proposal utilises existing resources and is subject to agreement by Regional Directors of F&amp;A.</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b> If funding is available from Program integrity, we will accelerate the process of developing the MYDP and merge it with the new classification system.</p>	<p><b>resources).</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System integrates the essential elements of the Blueprint for enhance reporting on financial and non-financial information.</li> <li>• No funding was identified for a departmental multi year disposal Plan and retention plan.</li> <li>• IMB developed, with limited funding available from Program Integrity II, a Web based applications to enable the inventory, tracking and management departmental information holdings.</li> <li>• IM coordinators were trained on the use of the applications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This initiative is considered a low priority as the current approach is to keep records until a Government of Canada policy is in place.</li> <li>• The National Archives is in the process of revising GoC policies for retentions and disposal.</li> <li>• EC will inventory its information holdings over the next 2-4 years and will implement revised National Archives policies when available.</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

	<p><b>Proposed action for development and update of departmental IM policies</b> Meet with TB officials to identify when central policies and guidelines on IM will be available</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b> TB is reviewing Central Agency policies and guidelines. It is recommended we differ. Departmental policies and guidelines until completion of their policies.</p> <p><b>Proposed action to establish standards for data and information management.</b> IMB has already reviewed some of the technologies on the market and piloted the TB shared systems initiative chosen application called RDIMS. The final report on the pilot confirmed that this technology is working within the technical environment in EC. The fact that there is already a contract and several departments using it is a major advantage. One of the main concerns is to implement a web-based version because this is the way of the future. <b>Timeline:</b> Final report on the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TB recently issued a new Management of Government information Policy.</li> <li>• We are currently assessing EC readiness vis-à-vis the new policy.</li> <li>• While waiting for the new policy, IMB prepared and released a number of departmental guidelines. An example of these is “How to deal with employees records when they leave the department”.</li> <li>• The design parameter for EC suite of IM products are based on Government of Canada and International data and information standards</li> <li>• Use of the Treasury Board Dublin Core information interchange standard as default metadata set for EC’s EnSuite document profiling.</li> <li>• Use of XML (internationally accepted) as EC’s standard of compatibility and interoperability.</li> <li>• A series of data management tools were developed and are</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMB established closed contact with the TB and is a member of all Information Management governing bodies. IMB is therefore fully aware and taking action to have “best of Breed” IM policies, guidelines and practices.</li> <li>• Department-wide implementation of data management tools will be included in the IM/IT long term financial plan as funding is required to complete this initiative.</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--

	<p>RDIMS pilot almost completed. Need to complete the technical part. A fully costed business case will be developed.</p>	<p>currently in pilot mode.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Update of the EC's Data Management Policy is underway and schedule for FY 03/04</li><li>• Data and information management are being integrated into EC's IM/IT architecture (results, guidelines, business practices and standards). Version 2 of the architecture will be release in the third quarter of FY 03/04</li></ul>	
--	---	---	--

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION 2 & MANAGEMENT RESPONSE			
Addressed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Partially Addressed <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Addressed <input type="checkbox"/>
INITIAL CONTEXT & RECOMMENDATION	INITIAL MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	ACTIONS TAKEN TO DATE	ACTION PLAN
<p>The Information Management Branch should develop a communication program to be used to inform staff across the department. These communications efforts should be sustained to ensure existing and new staff understand their information management responsibilities.</p>	<p><b>Proposed action to develop communications plan.</b> The IMB will develop a communication program with the support of the Regional Directors - Finance and Administration and the IMSC. This plan will include mandatory training sessions for employees as well as bulletins and a web-site to post valuable information on best practices in managing information. IMB will also organize a workshop on Information Management in the Fall 2001.</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b> Funding has been requested for the preparation of the material and travels across the country. This should be accomplished during the fiscal year 2001-2002</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a start, newsletters on best IM practices were sent to all employees.</li> <li>• A more formal awareness and training program will be developed next year to communicate IM policies, procedures and standards to all employees.</li> <li>• IMB also participating in various initiatives (i.e. Orientation program for new employee, Netiquette, etc)</li> <li>• Measures are in place through the EnSuite project to monitor the appropriate use of information in compliance with the MGI (Management of Government Information Policy).</li> <li>• Training has been provided to IM coordinators, libraries, records and help desks in all regions.</li> <li>• An IM website created. It includes all IM initiatives currently put forward by</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A one day mandatory training will be given to about 3000 employees of EC over the next 2 years. This includes fundamentals of IM, IM best practices, compliance to privacy and security of information and EnSuite training.</li> <li>• New employees engaged in creating and using information will receive the mandatory training.</li> <li>• Advance training will be provided to IM coordinators, libraries, records and help desks in all regions.</li> <li>• Communications is being developed for the implementation of EnSuite.</li> </ul>

		<p>IMB, the reference material for EnSuite users and best practices documentation on commonly found IM issues affecting EC employees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IM Seminars were held in the fall of 2001 and 2002. A third one is scheduled for end of October 2003. The seminars integrate the management of science and corporate information to increase the visibility and understanding of what is IM in EC.</li> <li>• Increased the networking and capacity of the IM community through training of IM coordinator in each region and through the IM Seminars. (~75 participants each of the last two years)</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION 3 & MANAGEMENT RESPONSE			
Addressed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Partially Addressed <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Addressed <input type="checkbox"/>
INITIAL CONTEXT & RECOMMENDATION	INITIAL MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	ACTIONS TAKEN TO DATE	ACTION PLAN
<p>The Information Management Branch must develop a full business case before any decision be taken on implementing an information management technological solution in the department. The <b>business case must identify and quantify the benefits, the implementation costs and on-going maintenance costs</b>, including system updates and customizations, support staff, and training of staff using the system. This analysis must be done in the context of moving toward Government-on-Line.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Proposed action for development of business case:</b> IMB, with the help of a consultant firm will prepare a full business case for implementing a technological solution in the department</li> <li>• <b>Timeline: First Quarter of fiscal year 2001-02</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A business case was conducted over the summer of FY 01-02. Options were developed based on services and regions business and technical requirements. The end result of the business case is the development on EnSuite, a set of electronic documents and records management tools.</li> <li>• DRAMS, EC's Departmental Records and Archives Management System was decommissioned and a third party replacement put in place (IBM record management - IBMrm). Users across the country have been trained and the migration of information as well as the change of application is complete.</li> <li>• The EnSuite project is expected to cost roughly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of EnSuite is scheduled to begin late October 2003 and will continue until full implementation, most likely by the end of FY 04-5.</li> </ul>

		<p>25% of what a third party Information Management system would cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Funding for the project has been secured for 7 years, subject to yearly review.</li><li>• The Review Branch has been invited to participate in all major IM events organized by IMB.</li><li>• The information managed through EnSuite is kept in its native format but metadata associated to the document is created in a format that supports e-government initiatives on interoperability.</li></ul>	
--	--	---	--