Township or Oro-Medonte

Information Resource Management (IRM) Program Strategy - Executive

14 November, 2021

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The Records and Information Management (RIM) practices of the Township of Oro-Medonte (the Township) are less mature than those of most small to medium-sized municipalities.

More specifically, in the Township of Oro-Medonte, there are weaknesses in RIM policy, procedure, storage infrastructure, resources, training, tools and leadership, creating opportunity for beneficial growth and renewal.

Action to create a more modern Information Resource Management (IRM) Program, setting aside traditional Records Management terminology and assumptions, should be taken. This 'Executive IRM Program Strategy' makes recommendations whose adoption would lead to the implementation of just such a modern IRM Program. The primary recommendations made herein are:

- Expand the role and authority of the IRM Program;
- Engage a resource to lead the IRM Program;
- Engage a second IRM Program staff member;
- Create an IRM Policy Framework, including a new 'Bylaw on IR Classification and Retention';
- Ensure that IRM is a formal accountability of Managers;
- Create a physical staging area for IRM work, in particular the digitization of paper documents;
- Regularly train employees in the content and implications of the renewed IRM Policy Framework;
- Temporarily use the current TOMRMS-based shared drives as the central managed repository into which to consolidate IRs from unmanageable repositories, while delaying the implementation of an EDRMS until better IRM practices have become established;
- Engage a service provider to assist in digitizing large volumes of legacy paper IRs;
- Clean up, digitize and consolidate paper and digital IRs into the TOMRMS-based shared drives;
- Establish and apply a procedure for regular paper and digital IR disposition;
- Monitor and regularly report on the percentage of the Township IRs stored in the TOMRMS-based shared drives; and
- Monitor and regularly report on IRM Program performance.

The estimated level of effort to fully implement a modern IRM Program in the Township of Oro-Medonte is up to 1386 person*days and $692K in capital costs, extended over a 3-year period. Much of the work recommended may be accomplished by existing employees. Two less comprehensive approaches have also been identified, one

including Medium and High priority recommendations, and one including only those recommendations deemed High priority. Respectively, over a 3-year period, these alternative approaches would require approximately 954 person*days and $260K and 556 person*days and $240K.

Though a considerable effort will be required, in order to succeed, IRM Program implementation should proceed confidently, and should involve all employees, Departments, repositories, and IR types. In order for permanent IRM culture change to occur, a modern IRM Program must receive Senior Management Team (SMT) approval, must benefit from ongoing sponsorship, and it must be perceived by all employees that this is so.

1. Glossary of IRM Terms

Access: right, opportunity, or means of finding, using or retrieving Information Resources (IRs).

Administrative Assistant (AA): employees who support all aspects of Township work by other employees, in particular the management of IRs.

Accountability: principle that individuals, organizations and the community are responsible for their actions and may be required to explain them to others.

Audit (of Information): examination of systems, data centre procedures, programming and system usages to determine the authenticity, security and efficiency of IRs and repositories in accordance with a pre-defined methodology and set of criteria.

Authenticity: the genuineness of an IR.

Capture: refers to the act of recording tacit information as an explicit IR.

Destruction: process of eliminating or deleting IRs beyond any possibility of recovery or reconstitution.

Disposition (of IRs): range of processes associated with implementing retention, destruction or transfer decisions, which are documented in disposition authorities, retention schedules or other policy instruments.

Document: a textual IR that can be treated as a unit.

Electronic Document Records Management System (EDRMS): information system primarily designed to assist an organization in managing its digital and paper IRs from creation to disposition, including the means to audit their status.

Employees: refers, collectively, to full-time, part-time, contractual, temporary staff, students, consultants or other third party service providers and any other individual granted access to Township IRs.

Function-based Classification Scheme (FCS): a policy instrument, often a standard, that provides a logical arrangement of IRs into distinct categories based on the kinds of work performed by the Township, forming a basis for setting rules on the life cycle management of those IRs.

Image: means the digital representation of an original paper-based IR that can be used to generate an intelligible and reliable reproduction of that IR, where:

a) the representation is made with the intention of standing in place of the original;
b) the interpretation of the reproduction yields the same information as the original; and
c) the limitations of the reproduction (e.g. resolution, tones or hues) are well defined and do not obscure significant details.

Information Resource (IR): means any data, content, document or artifact, regardless of format and medium, that assists in or records the progress of a Township Function (often formerly referred to as a 'record'). For greater certainty, this includes e-mail and other forms of text-based communication, structured datasets recorded in databases, audio recordings, websites, imaged documents, wiki, blog and social media content etc.

Information Resource Management (IRM) Program: means the Township program that is mandated to efficiently control the creation, receipt, maintenance, use, retention, protection, preservation and disposition of IRs.

Integrity (of IRs): reliability and trustworthiness of IRs, as affected by imaging systems, transmission systems, and repositories in which IRs were created, communicated, managed and stored.

Life Cycle (of IRs): means the stages in the life cycle of an IR including planning, creation/receipt/capture, organization, use/retrieval, storage, dissemination and publication, maintenance/protection/ preservation, retention, and disposition/destruction.

Litigation Hold: means an order preventing the destruction or disposition of IRs required for any actual or anticipated litigation or criminal investigations, audits, proceedings before a tribunal or similar actions.

Medium: physical material which serves as a functional unit, in or on which IRs or data is normally recorded, in which IRs or data can be retained and carried, from which IRs or data can be retrieved, and which is non-volatile in nature.

Metadata: data about IRs, indicating ownership, access restriction, grouping, source, authorship, distinguishing characteristics etc.

Personal Information: has the meaning given in the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA, Ontario).*

Process: a series of actions or events taking place in a defined manner leading to the accomplishments of an expected result.

Record: is an outdated expression generally replaced by the expression 'Information Resource'.

Record as Evidence Rules: means the statutory standards set out in the *Evidence Act*

(Canada), the *Evidence Act (Ontario)*, the CAN/HOGCB-72.11-93 *Microfilm & Electronic Images as Documentary Evidence* standard, the *Rules of Civil Procedure* and the common law business records exceptions to the hearsay rules.

Repository (approved): a physical or digital location where IRs are stored in a manner that permits their access and use by employees, during their entire life cycle. Approved repositories are ultimately the purview of the IRM Program and must be accessible to, and monitored by, the IRM Program.

Retention Period: specified period of time that IRs are kept to meet operational, legal, regulatory, fiscal or other requirements.

Retention Schedule: a schedule specifying the length of time, following a triggering event, that IRs must be retained before disposition is conducted.

Transitory File: means files that are only interim or redundant products of a Function yielding a more meaningful and useful IR *and* that are consequently not required to support ongoing work or to meet legal, regulatory, financial and historical obligations. Transitory files should be routinely destroyed by employees in the course of their work. The following are examples of transitory files:

> **Duplicates:** Exact copies of IRs, (e.g. hardcopy printouts from a database) that are used only for reference or informational distribution.
> **Insubstantial Drafts:** Interim versions of IRs that are subsequently improved to correct errors in typing, spelling, grammar or format, without altering the content itself.
> **Miscellaneous Notifications:** Notices or postings that do not relate to the Function of a Business Unit. May include: meeting announcements, reservations, confirmations, itineraries, acknowledgements, etc.
> **Reference Materials and Publications:** Materials received from outside the Township, which require no action and are utilized for reference purposes only. May include; technical reports, magazines, catalogues, periodicals, newsletters / newspapers, etc.
> **Transmittal Memos:** Letters or FAX cover sheets that accompany an IR but that do not add any substantive content or context to the transmitted IR.

Vital IRs: IRs without which the Township could not continue to function effectively. For clarity, Vital IRs include those that:

- Enable the organization to continue to function within its legal authorities, rights and responsibilities;
- Would require an inordinate time, effort or expense to reconstruct;
- Enable the Township to react quickly to emergencies and disasters;
- Must be maintained by law or regulation.

2.   Introduction

The Township of Oro-Medonte is "dedicated to provid[ing] the highest quality of Customer Service through personal accountability, integrity and respect." To deliver on this mission, the Township depends heavily on records and information.

Accordingly, the Township recognized that Records and Information Management (RIM) practices, resources and technologies should be assessed, and recommendations for improvement made, where appropriate.

To assess and document the RIM situation and requirements of the Township, yielding a Strategy for the renewal of RIM practices, a Consultant from Still Waters Consulting was engaged.

The IRM Program Strategy may be used in immediately planning and prioritizing specific tasks leading to the implementation of a modern digital IRM Program and the improvement of IRM practices at the Township, thereby helping to improve productivity, decrease risk, ensure compliance with legislative obligations, and contribute to the achievement of all Township objectives.

3.   Methodology

Over a two-week period, the Consultant met with 49 employees of the Township, representing all areas of activity. During these sessions, current RIM practices and requirements were discussed. The employees consulted, listed at Annex A, were asked a series of approximately 40 questions and discussed numerous hypothetical solutions, based on the questionnaire provided at Annex B. During these sessions, employees were invited to recount anecdotes and personal preferences concerning the way that records and information are and should be used in the fulfillment of work roles. Responses were noted as Observations, grouped according to the information life cycle stage to which they correspond, and are attached, in summary, at Annex C and, in detail, in the separately delivered Appendix. Observations made by the Consultant during a preliminary review of documentation provided by Township staff are also included in these Observations.

Based on the Observations, a descriptive overview of the current Township RIM environment is provided in Section 4. Based on the Township's goals, the requirements expressed by employees, and the knowledge and experience of the Consultant, a description of a desirable future state is provided at Section 5. By analysis of the gaps between the current state and the desired future state of the Township's RIM/IRM environment, and in consideration of his experience with other organizations, the Consultant then prepared a list of Recommendations for implementation. These Recommendations are presented in Section 6. Section 7 then organizes the Recommendations as an Action Plan over a three-year period and provides an estimation of the required level of effort and the cost of capital items. Note that alternate versions of this Action Plan are provided, each associated with different levels of municipal resourcing and prioritization.

4.   Overview of Current RIM Environment

The current Township RIM environment is derived from a traditional Records Management (RM) practice that has evolved, until recently, without an updated and clear mandate. It has consequently made only limited steps toward the management of the full range of records and information that is today the basis for, and the product of, the Township's work.

A single employee is formally tasked with the methodical life cycle management of the Township's records and information. That employee has no access to many repositories where the Township's records and information are stored and has few tools with which to facilitate work. Almost all Township employees indicate that they are overburdened with their core work and indicate that RIM activities are a low priority for them. At the same time, these employees expend considerable effort in informally managing records and information, with many Administrative Assistants (AAs) almost entirely employed in the reception, digitization, uploading, and retrieval of IRs. Managers recognize that RIM is a fundamental part of their work but there is little monitoring or enforcement of RIM-related obligations and best practices. RIM-related roles, such as MFIPPA response, litigation support, web site administration (that incorporates IRs within a classification structure and assigns meta-data to them, facilitating their display and retrieval by end-users), workflow analysis (that defines how IRs will be created, routed, stored and profiled in a digital environment), information privacy and security, and information systems architecture and design, are assigned to employees who are dispersed throughout the Township.

RIM vision, policy, procedure and business rules are incomplete and outdated. The Township's classification scheme, based on the 'TOMRMS' tool, does not reflect the actual work of the Township and the corresponding retention schedule is not adequately justified and documented.

The Township RIM environment is physically distributed, with most Departments using at least one repository for paper IR storage as well as numerous digital repositories. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, most employees have worked primarily from their homes, and have therefore transported both digital and paper information to those locations. Some employees refer to and create important documents while in the field. The distribution of IRs across many repositories, including some accessible solely by individuals, makes it difficult for employees to collaborate, and very difficult to take over other's duties during an absence or when an employee departs permanently. To reduce the requirement to seek information from other employees and other Departments, most employees retain redundant or 'shadow' copies of files in their personal folders, hard drives, email accounts, and personal devices. The decentralized storage and organization of IRs has resulted in retrieval challenges. Employees report that they spend about 28% of their time gathering and organizing IRs. Consequently, the

Township work environment is characterized by significant and unnecessary searching, re-work, productivity losses, compliance risk, and other inefficiencies.

The Township's work is conducted using a variety of software tools, including some older and unsupported products, none of which have effective workflow and document management capabilities. At this time, many new systems are being implemented that will automate business processes and that may facilitate the management of the resulting IRs.

Most of the IRs produced and stored by the Township are never disposed of. While the disposition of paper records is conducted using a centrally administered procedure, digital IRs are often disposed of without rigorous methodology. Staff departure, physical moves, system migrations and other irregular events can result in both inadvertent and arbitrary destruction of IRs.

Information privacy and security risks, primarily associated with remote work (which motivates employees to transmit or transport Township IRs to their personal homes or to alternate Township facilities) combined with staff turn-over (which creates opportunity for the destruction or theft of Township IRs), are significant.

In summary, the Township actively manages only a small percentage of its IRs, exposing the Township to risk and reducing its performance.

5.   Desirable IRM Program End-State

In the future, the Township's IRs will be treated much like financial resources (money) and human resources (employees).

Whenever an employee creates or receives an IR, training in a robust modern IRM Policy Framework will dictate to the employee whether they will immediately destroy a transitory file or declare an IR into an approved repository. When employees declare IRs into approved repositories, they will classify them according to the recognized business process from which they arose and will assign to them other descriptive and differentiating meta-data. Automatically, by virtue of the meta-data associated with an IR, a retention period, privacy treatment, access privileges, security designation, and other attributions will be made by the software applications that interface with the repository. No duplicates of declared IRs, nor any transitory IRs, will be stored and, gradually, all alternative and less manageable repositories will be eliminated.

When employees wish to locate an IR, or a collection of IRs, they need only search in a very small number of repositories. (A federated search tool may allow them to search across *all* approved repositories simultaneously.) Dependence on AAs and on any other intermediaries to locate IRs will decline. If a search is elaborate and an employee lacks the time or skillset necessary to conduct the search themselves, they will refer the query to IRM Program staff. Similarly, when there are requirements for legacy information clean-up or digitization, for IRM-related advice, or for other IRM-related services, employees will refer these matters to the IRM Program. When new employees arrive and when they depart from the Township, the IRM Program will provide relevant onboarding and offboarding services. All disposition of non-transitory IRs will be conducted by the IRM Program, based on the classification and retention meta-data associated with IRs in each of the approved repositories.

The IRM Program will use a regularly updated Volumetric Inventory to identify priorities for further enhancing and focusing IRM practices. For many years to come, the IRM Program will seek, by all its efforts and services, to increase the percentage of the Township's IRs that are stored in approved repositories, versus those that are stored in unapproved and unmanaged repositories. The IRM Program will also measure its effectiveness, annually, by surveying its internal clients, the Township's employees, using a series of quantifiable criteria, seeking to ensure that the Township employees feel that the IRM Program is assisting them in achieving their goals.

6. Specific IRM Program Recommendations

The specific IRM Program recommendations below are derived from the Observations summarized at Annex C. The suggested priority of each recommendation, either High, Medium or Low, is indicated.

1. Nomenclature – In conjunction with the adoption of a new IRM Program Vision (see Annex D) and a decision to develop of a new IRM Policy Framework, the Township Clerk should approve the use of the terms 'Information Resource (IR)' as the object of methodical management, 'Information Resource Management (IRM)' as the expression describing the new Program whose object is an 'IR', and 'Manager, Information Resource Management' as the title applicable to the new IRM Program head.

   Priority: High

2. Mandate – The Township Clerk should prepare a job description for a 'Manager, Information Resource Management', and this position should be staffed, leading to the engagement/assignment of a resource having overall responsibility for the implementation of the Township's IRM Program. Reporting to the Township Clerk, this resource should be directly responsible for the IRM Business Unit, described in Recommendation 3, and for the attainment of annual IRM Program goals.

   Priority: High

3. Policy Framework – The Manager, IRM, should initiate a project to develop a modern and comprehensive IRM Program Policy Framework, resulting in a number of well-integrated policies, procedures, standards and guidelines. Consequently, the Manager, IRM, should prepare a brief Request for Proposal (RFP) and should facilitate a competitive procurement to identify an external consultant having experience with other Ontario municipalities and thus with access to sample documents reflecting relevant best practices. Once a new IRM Policy Framework has been created and approved, all current IRM-related policies and procedures should be rescinded.

   Priority: High

4. Organization – The Manager, IRM, should be supported by a second IRM Program position, that of the IRM Analyst.

   Priority: High

5. Professional Development – The Manager, IRM, should develop a plan for the professional development of IRM Program staff, involving periodic offsite training for particular staff, participation in IRM professional organizations e.g. ARMA (Association of Records Managers and Administrators), and onsite knowledge sharing. IRM Program staff who successfully complete IRM-related education and certification should be refunded part or all of their tuition and certification fees, as is the Township's current practice.

    Priority: Low

6. Profile – The Manager, IRM, working with the HR Department, should initiate the amendment of the accountability profile of all Managers to explicitly include responsibility for the compliance with the Township IRM Policy Framework, if this responsibility is not currently included.

    Priority: Medium

7. Checklist – The Manager, IRM, should develop a checklist of specific IRM Program responsibilities that are effectively delegated to Managers with the addition of IRM to their accountability profile. The Manager, IRM, should then meet with each business unit Director to review, negotiate and agree to the responsibilities in this checklist. Subsequent to this approval process, similar discussions should be held with each respective Manager seeking their concurrence and signature.

    Priority: Low

8. Inventory – The Manager, IRM, should develop a Volumetric Inventory of all repositories where the Township IRs are stored. This inventory should be regularly refreshed, provided a progressive report of IR consolidation from storage in predominantly unmanaged repositories to storage in approved the Township repositories. See Annex F for a suggested Volumetric Inventory template.

    In order to create, populate, maintain and use this inventory in its daily work, the Manager, IRM, and Analyst, IRM, should be granted access to *all* repositories and *all* IRs of the Township of Oro-Medonte. This may necessitate additional clearance, training, oversight or written undertakings by these staff.

    Priority: High

9. Monitoring – Based on the checklist of IRM Program responsibilities delegated to each Manager, and the regularly updated Volumetric Inventory, the Manager, IRM, should begin a gradually intensifying annual process of IRM Program compliance monitoring, submitting a IRM 'report card' to each Manager, revealing their performance, and providing both positive feedback and instructions regarding work to be undertaken where deficiencies are identified.

   Priority: Low

10. Evaluation – The Manager, IRM, working with the Township Clerk, should annually evaluate the performance of the IRM Program, and use the results in planning of the subsequent year's IRM Program goals, projects, and resource requirements. The Manager, IRM, should also use this information to review, update and re-issue elements of the Township-wide IRM Policy Framework.

    Priority: High

11. Performance – The report cards of the individual Business Units and the results of evaluation of the IRM Program itself should be used by the Manager, IRM, to annually report IRM Program performance to the Senior Management Team (SMT).

    Priority: Low

12. Job Descriptions – The Manager, IRM, working with the Director of HR and SMT, should initiate work to enhance the job descriptions of all employees to indicate a positive responsibility to adhere to the expectations of the Township IRM Policy Framework, and performance appraisals should be altered correspondingly, rewarding employees for rigorous participation in the IRM Program.

    Priority: Medium

13. Orientation – The Manager, IRM, should enhance the new employee orientation process to ensure that the IRM Program is notified of the engagement of new employees, is given opportunity to meet new employees, and is able to schedule their participation in the next IRM Course. (See Recommendation 16.) Once this orientation is completed, the local AA should then meet with the new employee to answer any questions and to provide practical guidance regarding any IRM business rules and workflows specific to the employee's work role.

    Priority: Medium

14. Legal Opinion – To convince doubtful employees of the acceptability of some modern IRM practices, the Manager, IRM, should seek an informal legal opinion from its own Legal Counsel regarding the admissibility of scanned images of paper IRs, including those to which signatures were applied, and the signing of digital IRs with an approved digital signature technology, and should then embody this opinion in the IRM Policy Framework, IM Curriculum, and in the configuration and functionality scanners, the EDRMS and other technologies.

Priority: High

15. Change Management – The Manager, IRM, should develop a succinct business case for the IRM Program and later for the EDRMS implementation, and should develop a convincing change management plan. The IRM Program launch and, later, the EDRMS solution deployment, must commence with an enterprise-wide communications effort, in which an Executive Sponsor (the Township Clerk, Director of Corporate Services, or perhaps even the CAO) plays a visibly supportive and participatory role, explaining and themselves demonstrating the benefits of sound IRM to all employees. More intensive and encompassing change management planning and implementation must strive to measurably alter employee behaviour. Whereas preliminary communications may raise *awareness* of IRM program expectations and best practices, additional change management initiatives must ensure that employees achieve an *understanding* of these expectations and best practices, that there is full *participation* in the IRM Program and that, ultimately, every single employee internalizes a sense of *ownership* of sound IRM practices.

Priority: High

16. IRM Course – The Manager, IRM, should develop a new IRM course curriculum suitable for delivery to all current as well as all new employees. This course should be designed to immediately improve employee's ability to adhere to the IRM Policy Framework and to improve their productivity by correctly implementing IRM procedures and by using approved IRM tools. This course should address both technical features of the Township's work environment and particular IRM business rules e.g. "Who is responsible to declare an email message that is addressed to 3 employees ?". This curriculum should then be deployed by IRM Program staff, and then supported by the local AAs.

When a schedule for EDRMS implementation has been announced, the IRM curriculum should be revised, ensuring that functionality specific to the EDRMS product is meaningfully introduced. This course should be delivered by the Manager, IRM, or by the IRM Analyst, just prior to EDRMS deployment, and should be reinforced by individual meetings with employees by the local AA as employees return to their desks to use the EDRMS for the first time.

Priority: Medium

17. Promotion – Once they are available, the Manager, IRM, should promote the upon-request services offered by the IRM Program, ensuring that staff appreciate that IR retrieval, digitization, clean-up, advice, and other services are available. These services will be delivered by the Analyst, IRM.

Priority: Medium

18. AA Working Group – The Manager, IRM, should form an IRM Working Group composed of IRM Program staff and all Township AAs. The Working Group should meet regularly regarding IM initiatives, tasks and objectives, and to exchange IRM-related concerns, solutions and knowledge. AAs should be encouraged to regularly report requirements for new IRM policies, procedures, solutions and EDRMS features to the Manager, IRM.

Priority: Medium

19. AA Training – The Manager, IRM, should ensure that AAs receive regular cross-training in a range of IRM and technology practices so that they are able to fully contribute to the life cycle of both paper and digital IRs, and pass on these skills to the employees that they support. Training would be delivered primarily by the Manager, IRM, and Analyst, IRM. These cross-trained staff would respond to all other employee's questions regarding database/system usage, IRM policies and procedures, eventual EDRMS usage, and will also assist with many IRM Program initiatives. AAs will also participate in the documentation of Business Unit-specific workflows that may be automated using various databases/systems and an eventual EDRMS, and they would thereafter have the authority and ability to intervene in IR-dependent processes to ensure that that IRs are handled effectively and in accordance with the IRM Policy Framework.

Priority: Medium

20. Mail – The Manager, IRM, working with the appropriate SMT member and the HR Director, should identify a suitable administrative staff member to digitize all incoming mail, with particular documented exceptions, in accordance with a Procedure on Mail Management. The Manager, IRM, and Analyst, IRM, should provide this staff member with preliminary instruction and ongoing guidance.

    Priority: Low

21. Vital IRs – The Analyst, IRM, with reference to the FCS, should develop and implement a plan to ensure that vital IRs arising from the Township work are protected from loss during a disaster. Vital paper IRs should be prioritized for digitization, and then either retained in both hard copy and digital form or the digital form duplicated or mirrored to a secondary site, ensuring that at least one instance of all vital IRs will survive a disaster e.g. catastrophic fire at a Township location.

    Priority: High

22. Archives – The Analyst, IRM, should ensure that all IRs deemed to have archival value are firstly transferred into the keeping of the IRM Program and then to an external archival institution. The Analyst, IRM, will ensure that the Procedure on IR Preservation is applied, protecting these IRs and artifacts against degradation.

    Priority: Medium

23. Service Provider – The Manager, IRM, should develop a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the selection of a Digitization Service Provider (DSP) to conduct the on-demand digitization of paper and other legacy analog IRs. (Typically, small and urgent digitization efforts will be completed by the Analyst, IRM. Larger assignments, as well as the reverse chronological digitization of *all* legacy paper IRs will be assigned to the DSP.)

    Priority: High

24. EDRMS – At a future date, the Manager, IRM, with support from the Manager, Information Technology (IT), should develop a Request for Proposal for the selection, implementation, configuration and initial population of a cloud-based Electronic Document and Records Management System (EDRMS), to be used as the approved repository for all IRs that are not stored in specifically identified database/systems (sometimes referred to as Systems of Record).

    Priority: Low

25. Consolidation – While also responding to smaller and urgent requests for digitization, the Analyst, IRM, supported by the selected DSP, and by the Manager, IT, should begin the prioritized disposition of IRs that are transitory and that have exceeded their retention period, the digitization of non-transitory paper and digital IRs to a standardized digital format, and the migration of IRs from unapproved repositories into the current TOMRMS repository. (When an unmanaged repository has been permanently de-populated, it should be eliminated.)

Accordingly, a staging area, the 'Digitization Centre', located within a current records storage room at the Township site, should be created and equipped with a high volume scanner and other equipment and supplies. All IRM Program staff and AAs should be provided with training in the standardized operation of this equipment, the application of the Procedure on Digitization, and the procedures for declaring digitized IRs into the TOMRMS-based shared drive.

Priority: High

26. Cloud – The Manager, IRM, working with the Manager, IT, should study the current and any proposed future cloud-based IR repositories, ensuring that they meet the expectations of the Township IRM Policy Framework regarding IR retention, disposition, privacy and security. Where it cannot be confirmed that the Township IRs will be managed by the cloud storage provider as they would be if they were retained on premise, IRs should be repatriated and the relationship with the cloud storage service provider severed.

Priority: Low

27. Quality Assurance – The Manager, IRM, should establish a process to ensure the quality of IRs in managed repositories, seeking to identify anomalies in newly introduced as well as legacy IRs, referring these issues to the relevant Department most responsible. A list of all such anomalies should be maintained by the Analyst, IRM, with items being removed from the list only as they are addressed.

Priority: Low

28. Intervention - Policy, procedure and regular interventions by the Analyst, IRM, should seek to improve the IRM practices of staff. For instance, immediately, and certainly as the EDRMS is deployed to business units, staff should be discouraged and then deterred from using MS Outlook as an environment in which to store evidence of important decisions.

Priority: Low

29. Offboarding – After developing the Procedure on Employee Offboarding, the Analyst, IRM, should begin working with the Directors/Managers of Departments to apply it, so that the IRs, paper copy and digital, of an out-going employee are identified, captured, assessed and appropriately re-assigned or disposed of, possibly involving submission of IRs to the Digitization Centre for digitization and uploading.

    Priority: Medium

30. IRM Procedures Guide - The Manager, IRM, should develop an IRM Procedures Guide incorporating content from the IRM Policy Framework and addressing all additional topics and processes of the IRM Program. This IRM Procedures Guide should emphasize the recognition of digital IRs as official records of the Township, making them the primary object of management. The IRM Procedures Guide should identify and explain all of the procedures and tools needed to fulfill IRM policy. This IRM Procedures Guide should be designed for referral by the Township employees at all levels and especially by new employees.

    Priority: High

31. Mobility – The Manager, IRM, working with the Manager, IT, should conduct a study of both the technology and information life cycle requirements of remote digital workers, recommending both process and technology to ensure that all expectations of the IRM Policy Framework may be readily met by employees regardless of their physical location.

    Priority: Medium

32. Exchange – The Manager, IRM, should establish a standard for the exchange of digital IRs with external organizations, specifying formats, media, delivery protocols etc.) and should proactively offer it to each of them. Simultaneously, the Manager, IRM, and Manager, IT should initiate work to establish a web-based portal whereby trusted external organizations may exchange digital IRs with the Township, in accordance with the established standards and protocols, perhaps eventually leveraging the capabilities of the EDRMS solution.

    Priority: Low

33. Integrity – The Analyst, IRM, should regularly test the integrity of all approved repositories, the effectiveness of network security and privacy practices therein, as well as the vital IRs protocols. (Among other things, the effectiveness of network back-up routines should be tested.)

    Priority: Medium

34. Systems Approval - The Township Clerk should ensure the establishment of a collaborative practice whereby, whenever the Manager, IT, proposes to acquire and implement any new software application or database having the ability to create or store IRs, the approval of the Manager, IRM, is obtained, thus ensuring that this new database/system forms a policy-compliant part of the Township's IRM environment.

    Priority: Medium

35. Workflow Analysis - After basic EDRMS functionality has been widely implemented, the Manager, IRM, and Analyst, IRM, working with the Manager, IT, and referring to the FCS, should engage in an enterprise-wide process mapping exercise, seeking to identify and begin automating major IR-centric workflows.

    Priority: Low

7. Action Plan

The Action Plan is composed of numbered tasks along the vertical axis corresponding to the Recommendations of Section 5, extended over a 3-year period. In the cell at the intersection of each Recommendation and the fiscal quarter in which it should be undertaken, a symbol, from the legend below, identifies the resource who should perform the work. Consequently, this Action Plan indicates *who* should take *what* action at *what time*, and *how much effort and expenditure* will likely be required.

Three versions of this Action Plan are provided, each assuming differing degrees of support.

- The first version of the Action Plan assumes 'Ample Support', and so displays and totals the effort and costs associated with all High (H), Medium (M) and Low (L) priority Recommendations.

- The second version of the Action Plan assumes 'Modest Support', and so displays the effort and costs associated with just the High (H) and Medium (M) priority Recommendations.

- The third version of the Action Plan assumes 'Limited Support', and so displays the effort and costs associated with just the High (H) priority Recommendations.

<u>Legend</u>

Resource

C – Township Clerk
M – Manager, IRM
A – Analyst, IRM
AA – Administrative Assistant
L – Legal Counsel
IT – Information Technology Staff

IRM Program Action Plan – Ample Support

Task Title	Priority	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 1 Effort Days	Year 1 Capital	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 2 Effort Days	Year 2 Capital	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 3 Effort Days	Year 3 Capital	Totals Effort Days	Totals Capital
		2022						2023						2024							
Nomenclature	H	C				1	0					0	0					0	0	1	$0
Mandate	H	C				5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0
Policy Framework	H	M	M	M	M	50	60000	M	M			30	40000	M				10	0	90	$100,000
Organization	H		M	M		20	0					0	0					0	0	20	$0
Professional Development	L				M	2	0	M				2	6000	M				2	6000	6	$12,000
Profile	M					0	0	M	M			10	0					0	0	10	$0
Checklist	L					0	0			M	M	30	0	M				15	0	45	$0
Inventory	H	M				20	0	M				10	0					10	0	40	$0
			A	A	A	12	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	36	$0
Monitoring	L				M	10	0				M	15	0				M	20	0	45	$0
Evaluation	H				M	10	0				M	10	0				M	10	0	30	$0
Performance	L				M	2	0				M	3	0				M	3	0	8	$0
Job Descriptions	M					0	0	M	M			10	0					0	0	10	$0
Orientation	M					0	0	M				5	0					0	0	5	$0
Legal Opinion	H		M			5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0
				L		5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0

Still Waters Consulting

Item	Priority					#	$					#	$					#	$	Total $
Change Management	H			M		20	0	M				10	0	M				10	0	$0
IRM Course	M			M		5	20000					10	0					10	0	20,000
				A		5	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	$0
				AA		10	0	AA	AA	AA	AA	20	0	AA	AA	AA	AA	20	0	$0
Promotion	M					0	0	M	M	M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	5	0	$0
AA Working Group	M					0	0		M	M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	10	0	$0
AA Training	M					0	0		M	M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	10	0	$0
						0	0		A	A	A	10	0	A	A	A	A	10	0	$0
Mail	L					0	0		M			2	0	M				1	0	$0
						0	0			A	A	2	0		A	A	A	3	0	$0
Vital IRs	H					0	0			A	A	5	0	A	A	A	A	5	0	$0
Archives	M					0	0			A	A	20	0	A	A	A	A	10	0	$0
Service Provider	H		M			10	0	M				2	0	M				2	0	$0
EDRMS	L					0	0				M	20	20000	M	M	M	M	50	400000	420,000
						0	0				IT	20	0	IT	IT	IT	IT	50	0	$0
Consolidation	H	M	M	M	M	10	60000	M	M	M	M	10	40000	M	M	M	M	10	20000	120,000
		A	A	A	A	80	0	A	A	A	A	60	0	A	A	A	A	40	0	$0
Still Waters Consulting					IT	10	0	IT	IT	IT	IT	10	0	IT	IT	IT	IT	10	0	$0
Cloud	L					0	0		M			10	0					0	0	$0
						0	0		IT			10	0					0	0	$0
Quality Assurance	L					0	0			M	M	5	0					0	0	$0
						0	0			A	A	20	0	A	A	A	A	20	0	$0
Intervention	L					0	0	A	A	A	A	50	0	A	A	A	A	50	0	$0

#	Task	Pri					Hrs	Cost					Hrs	Cost					Hrs	Cost	Total Hrs	Total Cost
29	Offboarding	M			M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	5	0	25	$0
					A	A	20	0	A	A	A	A	40	0	A	A	A	A	20	0	80	$0
30	IRM Procedures Guide	H				M	10	20000				M	5	0				M	5	0	20	$20,000
31	Mobility	M			M	M	10	0					0	0					0	0	10	$0
					IT	IT	20	0					0	0					0	0	20	$0
32	Exchange	L				M	10	0					0	0					0	0	10	$0
						IT	5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0
33	Integrity	M				A	10	0	A	A	A	A	5	0	A	A	A	A	5	0	20	$0
	Still Waters Consulting					IT	5	0				IT	1	0				IT	1	0	7	$0
34	Systems Approval	M				C	2	0					0	0					0	0	2	$0
35	Workflow Analysis	L					0	0					0	0	M	M	M		15	50000	15	$50,000
															A	A	A		25	0	25	$0
							0	0				IT	10	0	IT	IT	IT		10	0	20	$0
							394	**$160,000**					**536**	**$106,000**					**456**	**$426,000**	**1386**	**$692,00**

IRM Program Action Plan – Modest Support

Task Title	Priority	Q1 (2022)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Effort Days (Year 1)	Capital	Q1 (2023)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Effort Days (Year 2)	Capital	Q1 (2024)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Effort Days (Year 3)	Capital	Effort Days (Totals)	Capital
Nomenclature	H	C				1	0					0	0					0	0	1	$0
Mandate	H	C				5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0
Policy Framework	H	M	M	M	M	50	60000	M	M			30	40000	M				10	0	90	$100,000
Organization	H		M	M		20	0					0	0					0	0	20	$0
Profile	M					0	0	M	M			10	0					0	0	10	$0
Inventory	H	M				20	0	M				10	0					10	0	40	$0
			A	A	A	12	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	36	$0
Evaluation	H				M	10	0				M	10	0				M	10	0	30	$0
Job Descriptions	M					0	0	M	M			10	0					0	0	10	$0
Orientation	M					0	0	M				5	0					0	0	5	$0
Legal Opinion	H		M			5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0
			L			5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0
Change Management	H			M		20	0	M				10	0	M				10	0	40	$0
IRM Course	M			M		5	20000					10	0					10	0	25	$20,000
Still Waters Consulting					A	5	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	29	$0
					AA	10	0	AA	AA	AA	AA	20	0	AA	AA	AA	AA	20	0	50	$0
Promotion	M					0	0		M	M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	5	0	15	$0
AA Working Group	M					0	0		M	M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	10	0	20	$0
AA Training	M					0	0		M	M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	10	0	20	$0
						0	0		A	A	A	10	0	A	A	A	A	10	0	20	$0

ID	Name	Pri					Hrs	Cost					Hrs	Cost					Hrs	Cost	Total Hrs	Total Cost
21	Vital IRs	H					0	0			A	A	5	0	A	A	A	A	5	0	10	$0
22	Archives	M					0	0			A	A	20	0	A	A	A	A	10	0	30	$0
23	Service Provider	H		M			10	0	M				2	0	M				2	0	14	$0
25	Consolidation	H	M	M	M	M	10	60000	M	M	M	M	10	40000	M	M	M	M	10	20000	30	$120,000
			A	A	A	A	80	0	A	A	A	A	60	0	A	A	A	A	40	0	180	$0
						IT	10	0	IT	IT	IT	IT	10	0	IT	IT	IT	IT	10	0	30	$0
29	Offboarding	M			M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	10	0	M	M	M	M	5	0	25	$0
					A	A	20	0	A	A	A	A	40	0	A	A	A	A	20	0	80	$0
30	IRM Procedures Guide	H				M	10	20000				M	5	0				M	5	0	20	$20,000
31	Mobility	M			M	M	10	0					0	0					0	0	10	$0
					IT	IT	20	0					0	0					0	0	20	$0
33	Integrity	M				A	10	0	A	A	A	A	5	0	A	A	A	A	5	0	20	$0
						IT	5	0				IT	1	0				IT	1	0	7	$0
34	Systems Approval	M				C	2	0					0	0					0	0	2	$0
							365	**$160,000**					**347**	**$80,000**					**242**	**$20,000**	**954**	**$260,000**

IRM Program Action Plan – Limited Support

Task #	Task Title	Priority	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 1 Effort Days	Year 1 Capital	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 2 Effort Days	Year 2 Capital	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 3 Effort Days	Year 3 Capital	Totals Effort Days	Totals Capital
					2022		Days				2023		Days				2024		Days		Days	
1	Nomenclature	H	C				1	0					0	0					0	0	1	$0
2	Mandate	H	C				5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0
3	Policy Framework	H	M	M	M	M	50	60000	M	M			30	40000	M				10	0	90	$100,000
4	Organization	H		M	M		20	0					0	0					0	0	20	$0
8	Inventory	H	M				20	0	M				10	0					10	0	40	$0
				A	A	A	12	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	A	A	A	A	12	0	36	$0
10	Evaluation	H				M	10	0				M	10	0				M	10	0	30	$0
14	Legal Opinion	H		M			5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0
				L			5	0					0	0					0	0	5	$0
15	Change Management	H			M		20	0	M				10	0	M				10	0	40	$0
21	Vital IRs	H					0	0			A	A	5	0	A	A	A	A	5	0	10	$0
23	Service Provider	H		M			10	0	M				2	0	M				2	0	14	$0
25	Consolidation	H	M	M	M	M	10	60000	M	M	M	M	10	40000	M	M	M	M	10	20000	30	$120,000
			A	A	A	A	80	0	A	A	A	A	60	0	A	A	A	A	40	0	180	$0
						IT	10	0	IT	IT	IT	IT	10	0	IT	IT	IT	IT	10	0	30	$0
30	IRM Procedures Guide	H				M	10	20000				M	5	0				M	5	0	20	$20,000
							268	$140,000					164	$80,000					124	$20,000	556	$240,000

Annex A – Consultation Schedule

Note: The names of employees who did not attend the scheduled consultation session have been struck out; however, some may appear in another session.

#	Date/Time	Business Unit	Attendee	Title
1	14 Sep 21, 12:15 Confirmed	• Senior Management Team (SMT)	• Robin Dunn • Andria Leigh • Donna Hewitt • Shannon Johnson • Hugh Murray • Tamara Obee • Michelle Jakobi • Shawn Binns	• CAO • Director of Development Services • Director of Corporate Services • CFO, Treasurer • Fire Chief • Manager Human Resources and Safety • Acting Director Environmental Services • Director, Operations & Community Services
2	27 September at 3:00-4:30	• Building	• ~~Andria Leigh~~ • Garry McCartney • Delanie Wilson • Dave Saunders • Sherri Moore • Tammy Strangemore • Mike Ryan	• Chief Building Official • Manager, Development Engineering • Deputy Chief Building Official • Inspector Building • Plans Examiner • Septic inspector • Permit intake Technician

#	Date/Time	Business Unit	Attendee	Title
3	September 29 at 1:30 pm confirmed	• Planning	• Derek Witlib • ~~Catherine McLean~~ • Andy Karaiskakis • Dave Yauk • Teresa Falconi • Theresa Farmer	• Planning Manager
4	Complete	• Clerk Division +	• Donna Hewitt • Yvonne Aubichon • Janette Teeter • Sheila Spring • Vanessa Cooper • Julia Johnson	• Director Corporate Services
5	September 27 at 1pm Confirmed	• Communications/Economic Development	• ~~Jenny Leggett~~ • Jen Whitley • Sam Flowers	• Communications & Public Relations Officer • Website Information Coordinator
6	September 15 at 1:00	• Environmental Services	• Michelle Jakobi • Chad Robinson • Jennifer Barrick • Pam Silk	• Director, Environmental Services • Administrative Assistant • Manager, Environmental Services • Environmental Services Technologist • Environmental Services Coordinator
7	September 28 at 1pm	• Fire & Emergency Services	• Hugh Murray • Helga Dreschler • ~~Melanie Brown~~ • Janice McDonald • Jessica Martins • Jenny Legget	• Director, Fire & Emergency Services • Fire Special Projects Coordinator • Fire Prevention Officer • Deputy Fire Chief • Division Chief – Training • District Chiefs

#	Date/Time	Business Unit	Attendee	Title
8	September 28 at 3pm Confirmed	• Human Resources	• Tamara Obee • Samantha McFarlane • Shelley Cadogan	• Manager, Human Resources & Safety • Health & Safety HR Advisor • HR Assistant
9	September 16 at 10:30 am confirmed	• Information Technology	• Harold Daynard • Jason Scharapenko • Patrick Howse	• Manager, Information Technology • IT Technician • IT Help Desk Technician
10	September 15 at 9am	• Municipal Law Services	• Curtis Shelswell • ~~Jordan Decarie~~ • Sheila Linton	• Manager, Municipal Law Services/Chief MLE Officer • Supervisor, Municipal Law Enforcement • Municipal Law Assistant • Municipal Law Enforcement Officers
11	September 29th at 8:30-10:00 am Confirmed	• Community Services	• Roz Llewllyn • Ryan Anderson	• Manager, Parks & Facilities • Operations Coordinator
12	September 13th 1pm-3pm Confirmed	• Operations/IPC	• Shawn Binns • Karla Musso-Garcia • Scott Thomson • Jennifer McLean • Justin Metras • Brad Robinson	• Director, Operations & Community Services • Manager, Operations • Operations Coordinator-Transportation • Operations Technical Coordinator
13	September 13th 9 am – 11 am Confirmed	• Finance	• Shannon Johnson • Derek Hnatiuk • Lianne MacGibbon • ~~Janice MacDonald~~ • ~~Jessica Martins~~ • Susan Swailes	• Director, Finance/Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer • Manager, Finance/Deputy Treasurer • Financial Analyst • Accounts Payable Clerk • Senior Revenue Clerk

Annex B – Questionnaire

Ice-Breaker: Given a very inclusive notion of 'records and information', what RIM/IM-related problems impede or frustrate you in your work ?

1. Describe the information-dependent functions and activities that are performed in your Business Unit.

2. Describe the records/document/IR types that are created in your area.

3. Is there a plan for how records/documents/IRs are managed ?

4. Is there a policy and subordinate procedures for how records/documents/IRs should be managed ?

5. Who uses these records/documents/IRs ? How often are the records/ documents referred to ?

6. Where are records/IR/documents and their duplicates stored ?

7. Discuss the approximate volumes or number of records/documents/IRs stored in various accessible locations and systems.

8. When is a record/IR considered inactive?

9. Who is responsible for the records/IRs?

10. Are there any unofficial i.e. highly localized file plans or lists available?

11. Do you work predominantly with paper or digital records/IRs?

12. How do you organize your digital documents/IRs?

13. Is the TOMRMS classification scheme, used in your shared drives, effective ?

14. Do you prefer to keep files in your office or in a central location? Paper or digital files? And if they do have a preferred location, why?

15. Do you keep work files on your personal drive or on the shared drive?

16. How do you organize your email ? Are you able to find the (email) information that you need ? How many e-mails do you currently have, in total ? (Number of messages, megabytes, etc.)

17. Are there any identifiable retention periods for the information that you maintain ? Are there any legislated requirements ? If so, what Act or regulation applies ?

18. What records do you consider to be essential ?

19. What sorts of RIM/IM problems do you encounter ? (sheer volumes, redundancy, loss, irretrievability, inability to identify creator/OPI, poor collaboration, version control etc.)

20. What is your role in RIM/IM ?

21. Where do we want to be ? What are your RIM/IM targets (quantifiable and non-quantifiable) ?

22. What is the general climate and attitude towards strict RIM/IM as a habitual element of work ?

23. When someone leaves what happens to the IRs that were in their possession/control ?

24. What activities of your group necessarily generate documents, according to a formal schedule or sequence ? e.g. annual report ? Could the process of assembling such a document be effectively automated, or would this merely become burdensome ?

25. Are you familiar with the official procedures for RIM/IM in your organization ?

26. Are there redundant copies of paper and digital files in your office ? Other messy situations ?

27. Have there been RIM crises in the past e.g. impossible MFIPPA requests, losses of important information, breaches of privacy, discovery of inaccurate or incomplete historical documentation, system failures (hard drive, network outage, hackers) etc. ?

28. Identify some important documents or records. *Why* are these documents important ?

29. Describe the unique features of these documents and their life cycle (creation, editing, approval, publication, management, revision, archival, retrieval, destruction).

30. What percentage of your time do you spend trying to organize and retrieve information ?

31. Describe the role of these documents in your daily activities (do they prompt your activities, regulate your activities, record your activities, impede your activities ?)

32. How is engineering information managed (drawings, maintenance reports, test results etc.)

33. Are you familiar with EDRMS functionality ? What features would benefit you most in your work ?

- version control,
- check-in/out,
- multiple taxonomies,
- controlled vocabulary,
- unique navigation methods,
- editing/approval processes,
- automated notification and/or distribution,
- automated publishing,
- collaborative authoring/KM requirements,
- usage log reporting,
- other forms of activity or event reporting ?
- other special features ?

34. How many and what sort of documents are to be managed, that are purely transitory ?

35. What applications are in use that have RIM/RIM workflow-like capabilities ?

36. How is disposition conducted today ?

37. What RIM application/solutions e.g. Sharepoint, Laserfiche etc. have you so far investigated, encountered or considered ? Is there a corporate preference for one particular solution ? If so, why ?

38. Comment on any limitations or desired enhancements to existing RIM systems.

36. What legacy records/IRs should be migrated into any new RIM system ?

37. How clean is the legacy data ? Will data cleansing be needed in the course of migration ?

38. Will/should there be any Web/Intranet access to any portion of the content for which you're responsible ?

39. Are documents and records published to the public ? In what form (printed paper, Web content, email content, email attachments, other digital dissemination services etc.) ?

40. Need for a data format/medium policy ?

41. Need for an email management policy ? Should imaging systems offer digital forms, for print-on-demand or for online completion/ submission ?

42. Need for an enhanced forms management policy ?

43. Need for a vital records program ?

44. Need for integration with other existing software applications ?

45. What criteria do you and would you like to use in searching for records/IRs ?

46. Do you perform research using other internal group's documents ? Do other internal groups perform research using your documents ?

47. Discuss who should have access to particular records/IRs.

48. Do you work with records/IRs that are produced from databases, that are essentially forms that are populated with numbers during a printing process ?

49. What meta-data do you need to associate with your records/IRs in order to control their life cycle ?

50. Are there any occasional or regular large-scale research/discovery activities that require thematic searching and analysis ?

51. What records/IRs cannot be stored and managed in digital form ? Why ?

52. Describe the types of email message created (internal and external) and their role in ordinary business functions. Are there any emails that constitute formal triggers to action ?

53. How is email content integrated into existing file systems, if at all ?

54. How intrusive could a records/IRs submission template be without deterring users from submitting ?

55. Would you wish to be able to share your records/IRs digitally with any other internal systems or external organizations ?

56. How would you measure the success of a RIM Program ?

57. What should be the RIM priorities for the future?

58. Would you emphasize if there were limited funding to spend on RIM renewal ?

Annex C – Summary of Observations

1.   Organizational Facts

1.1   The Township employs 86 full-time staff plus 72 part-time/seasonal staff.
1.2   The Township operates from numerous physical facilities and, since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, has also operated from employee homes.
1.3   The Township has always had a 'records management' or 'records and information management' function.
1.4   Some employees of the Township are members of a union.
1.5   Key stakeholders express concern about the level of RIM knowledge of Township employees.
1.6   The Township's Request for Proposal (RFP) placed emphasis on digitization, work from home due to COVID, multiple repositories, scanning, redundant digital/paper copies, lack of integrated retention/disposition capability, Generally Accepted Recordkeeping Practices (GARP), cost savings and efficiencies, Electronic Document Management Systems (EDRMS), the elimination of physical records storage, FOI/MFIPPA response, etc.
1.7   It is probable that financial support for the implementation of a new RIM Strategy will be available from the Province, at a later date.
1.8   Key stakeholders indicate that they believe the Township to be "low on physical space, but well-staffed".
1.9   A previous Service Level Review identified a long series of projects that the Township has begun to undertake, including 'Records Digitization', 'Digital Signature', MS Office 365 implementation etc.

2.   RIM Work Environment

2.1   There are numerous external sources of authoritative direction for the RIM practices of the Township.
2.2   Employees report extensive staff turn-over and organizational change during the past few years.
2.3   Most employees were aware of no overall RIM Program plan comparable to operational plans for other Functions of the Township.
2.4   The Township current work environment is entirely dependent on power and high-speed Internet access.
2.5   Most employees indicate that policy and procedure defining RIM requirements and practices are lacking.
2.6   Most employees have outdated beliefs or uncertainty regarding the object and methods of RIM.
2.7   Employees express ambivalence regarding the terminology to use in referring to RIM concepts and the expression 'Information Resources' is likely acceptable.

2.8   Some employees indicate that information handling tasks consume a large part of their work day.

2.9   Most employees indicated that their current workload is excessive and that, therefore, additional RIM-related duties cannot be easily undertaken.

2.10   All employees indicate that, should new Township RIM policy, procedure, expectations and initiatives be established, corresponding implementation and compliance management techniques should be primarily supportive and tolerant.

2.11   Most employees express no concern regarding the suggestion of an increasingly digital work environment, although a few employees insist on the importance of retaining paper as a reliable storage medium.

2.12   Employees and Township documents reviewed identify no serious information-related crises during the past few years.

2.13   Employees report few serious risks and vulnerabilities relating to RIM.

2.14   Some employees indicate that Township employees will resist change in RIM practices and expectations.

2.15   Overall, employees were receptive to discussion regarding their RIM practices, though a few, including senior staff, were confused or angered by the suggestion of change.

2.16   Most employees were willing, though not enthusiastic, to spend the full 2 hours scheduled in consultation.

3.   Employee Training, RIM Knowledge and Capacity

3.1   Employees report receiving little or no RIM-related training.

3.2   There is a 'Records Management Training' presentation that is used to deliver RIM training to employees.

3.3   The 'FOI Presentation' currently used by RIM to instruct employees regarding their responsibilities under MFIPPA 2000.

3.4   Employees RIM knowledge (vocabulary, concepts, best practices, technology etc.) and ability to express their requirements is poor.

3.5   Most employees believe that RIM tasks are either explicitly or implicitly indicated in their job descriptions.

4.   The Role and Services of the 'Records and Information Management Program'

4.1   The role of the RIM Program is unclear and undocumented at this time.

4.2   Senior Management is committed to establishing a robust modern RIM Program.

4.3   In the organizational chart dated August 2021, the RIM function is accomplished by one full-time employee, supported by a part-time student, reporting to the Deputy Clerk.

4.4   Employees indicate that there is no inventory of Township records and information to consider when making RIM decisions and most agree that a volumetric measure of RIM Program success would be meaningful.

4.5   Most employees agree that a hypothetical renewed RIM Program could both implement some enterprise-wide initiatives and offer a suite of advantageous services.

4.6   At this time, there is no regular audit or evaluation of RIM practices.

4.7   Employees suggest elements of the role of a renewed RIM Program.

4.8   A few employees suggest that the RIM Program should be partially distributed to specifically identified employees in Departments.

4.9   Employees identified possible goals for the RIM Program.

4.10   Employees generally agree that the RIM Program should have greater access to and control of records and information.

5.   Information Resource Creation

5.1   The vast majority of Township records and information is created or received in digital form.

5.2   The Township employees obtain important structured and unstructured records and information from external organizations.

5.3   The Township has no formal standards defining acceptable and advantageous tools, protocols, file formats and media for exchange and distribution involving external organizations.

5.4   Scanning of paper records is currently performed by numerous employees using different devices and no consistent standards or methods.

5.5   Employees cite few legitimate reasons for retaining some records and information in paper form.

5.6   When creating records and information, employees currently record little or no descriptive meta-data about or with the file.

5.7   When creating records and information, employees have no methodology for versioning.

5.8   Incoming physical mail is generally routed, using mailboxes, to the relevant employees. Some documents are subsequently scanned, as part of specific business processes.

5.9   Employees indicate that some outside parties, who supply paper documents to the Township, could be asked to supply digital documents instead.

5.10   Employees agree that additional digitization of paper records is justified and would be beneficial.

5.11   Employees universally indicate that consolidation from many repositories to a smaller number is justified.

6.   Information Resource Workflow and Collaboration

6.1   There is no authoritative list or definition of the Township's business processes, nor does the TOMRMS classification scheme provide this.
6.2   Many Township business processes involve collaboration between, or extend across, multiple Business Units.
6.2   Currently, many employees identify the importance of email as a collaboration, decision-making, and record-keeping environment.
6.3   The Township has already begun to digitize many of its business processes.
6.4   Those business processes that involve members of the public will have to remain available via analog means even if digitized.
6.6   Some employees express enthusiasm regarding the hypothetical establishment of a portal that could be used by employees and external partner organizations to exchange information with the Township.
6.7   The Township currently utilizes manual signatures or applied images of Managers' signatures as a weak form of eSignature:
6.8   A small number of employees indicate that a physical signature is a legal requirement in some instances.
6.9   Employees indicate that, in order to digitize whole business processes, an external analyst would have to consult extensively with employees to define these processes.
6.10   Most employees believe that, in the future, service delivery will be increasingly digital i.e. self-help via a public-facing web site.

7.   Information Resource Declaration, Classification, Profiling, and Meta-data

7.1   Employees declare only a small percentage of the records and information arising from their work into centrally managed shared drives.
7.2   Centrally managed shared drives are organized using a localized instance of the TOMRMS classification scheme.
7.3   The Township's TOMRMS classification scheme and retention schedule are included in and authorized by Bylaw 2013-116.
7.4   Many employees report that they cannot identify a suitable TOMRMS entry when trying to declare and classify a record.
7.5   When employees have trouble classifying a record, there is no single way of proceeding.
7.6   Inconsistent use of TOMRMS over many years has led to the loss of some records, the deprivation of records from many who require access to them, and considerable duplication, among other problems.
7.7   Employees suggest, overall, that the TOMRMS classification scheme should be retained in the short-term and renewed or replaced in the long-term.
7.8   The Township's TOMRMS classification scheme is not supplemented by any other information architecture, meta-data model, file naming convention, standardized symbology etc.

7.9 To design a new function-based classification scheme, with definitions, business process steps, record types, relevant meta-data values, retention periods and supporting citations etc., would be a substantial but beneficial effort building on recent and ongoing work.

7.10 Employees believe that asking employees to assign meta-data to records will be difficult.

7.11 Outside of managed shared drives, where TOMRMS is used, folder structures and labelling of records have typically been designed casually by Township employees while engaged in the work from which records and information arise.

7.12 At this time, the Township does not mark documents consistently to indicate their level of sensitivity.

7.13 There is currently little control or review to ensure the correct classification, grouping, indexing or assignment of records and information in Township repositories.

8.   Information Resource Storage

8.1 There is currently no comprehensive inventory of Township's paper and digital records and information.

8.2 Most employees agree that they store records relating to the same work in multiple locations and, quite often, redundantly store precisely the same records in multiple locations.

8.3 Most employees have printed reference material and case files in shelving and on their desks during the work day.

8.4 Township Business Units have their own local storage of paper records.

8.5 The Township keeps some important records in the 'vault'.

8.6 The Township's primary central physical records storage location is known as the 'bunker'.

8.7 The 'Baker' database is used to identify and index paper records that are primarily stored in the 'vault'.

8.8 The 'Laserfiche' software application is primarily used to manage the scanning of paper records, but also houses the scanned images, using the TOMRMS structure.

8.9 Most employees indicate willingness to have their file cabinets removed as part of a hypothetical digitization initiative.

8.10 Most employees store Township records and information on the hard drive of their laptop of PC.

8.11 Currently, Township employees do not have a 'personal' drive, but rather are assigned a particular folder in a shared drive, that remains accessible to other employees.

8.12 Shared drives are used extensively for the storage of Township records and information.

8.13 Some employees indicate that they have stored Township records and information on personal devices.

8.14 Some employees have begun storing Township records and information in public 'cloud'-based repositories, like DropBox.

8.15 There are currently no rules, restrictions or technical impediments to the use of USB devices and other removable media for file storage.

8.16 Most employees agree that there are too many repositories in which employees can, and do, store records and information, affecting their ability to find information when needed.

8.17 Most employees believe that the centralization of information resource storage will improve their retrievability.

8.18 Employees store very large volumes of Township records and information in email accounts.

8.19 Employees also store considerable volumes of records in 'temporary drives', which are shared drives that are accessible by multiple Departments.

8.21 Some employees indicate that voice-mail accounts are considered transitory, while others confirm that their contents are retained, and for good reason.

8.22 IT staff indicate that, in 5 years, shared drive storage volumes have grown by factor of 10.

8.23 Many employees indicate that, due to the storage of records in multiple locations without standardized classification and often in considerable redundancy, other employees would have trouble carrying on their work were they to become unavailable.

9. Information Resource Access, Sharing and Retrieval

9.1 Overall, Township employees report spending approximately 28% of their time performing information handling tasks, primarily searching and retrieval: (87, 75, 50, 25, 30, 30, 25, 25, 25, 30, 17, 20, 25, 7, 7, 20, 50, 15, 17, 10, 12, 65, 20, 12, 15, 17, 20, 47, 82, 25, 27, 7, 5, 15, 25, 70, 90, 25, 20, 2, 2, 2).

9.2 All employees acknowledge the fundamental importance of finding accurate and complete records and information to support their work.

9.3 Almost all employees indicate that Township records and information are difficult to locate and retrieve.

9.4 Most employees indicate that the current Township access model restricts access unnecessarily and impedes work.

9.5 At this time, the RIM Program does not have access to most of the records and information created and used by the Township.

9.6 All employees indicate that it would be beneficial if records and information were more readily retrievable by employees from a smaller number of central repositories.

9.7 Currently, the Township's access model is designed and administered by IT staff.

9.8   Some employees indicate that a more liberal information access model, whereby employees can, by default, access records and information arising from the work of all other employees, with some well-justified exceptions, would be advantageous.

9.9   A few employees indicate that one effective means of locating records and information is to search in their personal email collections.

9.10   Some employees rarely if ever need to search for records that are stored in paper format in central locations such as the vault.

9.11   Employees indicate that there are regular forensic and thematic search requirements applicable to Township records and information.

9.12   Employees indicate that FOI requests and responses, in particular, are becoming more demanding.

9.13   A few employees suggest that the number of FOI requests could be reduced by proactively disclosing frequently requested information.

9.14   Some employees indicate a desire to conduct federated and sophisticated searching across Township repositories.

9.15   Some employees indicate that a graphical navigation interface to records and information would be beneficial.

10   Information Resource Retention, Preservation, Disposition and Archiving

10.1   The Municipal Act requires that the Township establish and apply a retention schedule to its records.

10.2   The Township's current retention schedule corresponds to an incomplete classification scheme, lacks legal, financial, historical and operational citations, and includes numerous questionable retention periods.

10.3   At this time, the Township's retention schedule is generally applied only to paper records, almost all of which originate as digital records.

10.4   The disposition of paper records is facilitated by the availability and use of 'Shred-it' boxes distributed throughout the Township office environment.

10.5   In the absence of a comprehensive retention schedule and supporting practices, some informal and departmentally administered retention and disposition practices have become established.

10.6   Notwithstanding the absence of a methodical disposition policy, procedure and practice, employees indicate that they often destroy records and information.

10.7   When employees leave the Township, the clean-up of the records and information resulting from their work is inconsistent and often results in losses.

10.8   Employees indicate that, even when disposition is conducted, it is ineffective in eliminating all copies of a record.

10.9   Currently, there is no methodology or regular effort to ensure the continuing availability, legibility and interpretability of records and information.

10.10 Some Township records have archival value and should be periodically transferred to other institutions.

10.11 Most employees agree that a comprehensive clean-up of records and information would be advantageous, though many worry at the level of effort required.

11   Information Resource Security, Privacy and Protection from Disaster

11.1   The Township has very little written policy or procedure regarding information privacy and security.

11.2   There are some physical information security risks at the Township location.

11.3   There are some digital information security risks in the Township work environment.

11.4   The Township has no standard for the identification of levels of information sensitivity and does not consistently mark records to indicate their sensitivity.

11.5   The Township has no vital records protocol, and is therefore largely dependent on the effectiveness of network back-up tapes for recovery from a disaster.

11.6   Currently, the Township is unprepared for a possible disaster resulting in the destruction of records and information.

11.7   The Township Information Technology Department monitors network activity, but does not intrusively monitor employee use of technology.

11.8   Employees necessarily create records and information when working remotely, where security, privacy and control of information is difficult to ensure.

11.9   Most employees indicate that there is little employee-specific personal information at the Township office.

11.10 IT staff indicate that overall network security requires enhancement.

11.11 Information privacy and security are primarily achieved by isolating sensitive information in locations that are accessible by individuals or small groups of relevant employees.

12   Computing Environment and Employee Use of Technology

12.1   The Township's technological environment is a hybrid, with some cloud-based and some on-premise systems and storage.

12.2   IT staff indicate that there are no particular trends or directions for the Township's technologies.

12.3   Some Township employees have a low level of technological capability e.g. difficulty using Zoom, not knowing where their hard drive is located and whether it is backed up etc.

12.4   Employees report using a modest number of systems currently.

12.5   Employees report some deficiencies in their current technological work environment.

12.6 The Information Technology Department is currently undertaking many new initiatives.

12.7 Though the Township use a variety of software applications to house records and information, knowledge of Electronic Records and Document Management Systems (EDRMS) specifically designed for this purpose is weak.

12.8 IT staff indicate that, generally, data hosting must be within Canadian borders, but that they will study opportunities on a case-by case basis.

12.9 The recent Service Level Review recommends upgrading Laserfiche to assume the records management role that Baker currently serves.

12.10 Relevant employees indicate that they are able to operate AutoCAD from Township devices while working from home, and that file exchange has not proven problematic.

Annex D – Recommended IRM Program Vision

Information Resources (IRs) are critical and strategically important assets. Like financial and human resources, IRs must to be effectively managed using defined principles, reflected in management practices, programs, policies, standards, guidelines, procedures, business rules and facilitating tools.

We will conduct each stage in the Information Resource Management (IRM) life cycle in a disciplined and methodical manner, thus permitting more effective and efficient administrative work and service delivery, better decision-making, the optimization of the value of its investment in knowledge and information, reductions in costs, reductions in risk, reductions in storage volumes, and improved sharing of knowledge and information both within our organization and with key external stakeholders.

Given our increasingly complex digital work environment, a cultural shift will be required to achieve this vision and to meet the needs of our employees and stakeholders.

The Manager, Information Resource Management (IRM), will be responsible for the fulfillment of this vision.

IRM Program success will mean that:

The lifecycle of all IRs, regardless of their medium, is reliably managed so that:

- IRs are created in a standardized way;
- IRs are named, classified, indexed, profiled and grouped meaningfully;
- IRs are stored safely and appropriately in a small number of approved repositories;
- IRs are retained only as long as defined in an approved retention schedule;
- IRs are protected from alteration, loss, and unauthorized access and disclosure;
- IRs are easily and quickly retrievable and usable in the course of decision-making, service delivery and other work;
- IRs are methodically destroyed following the pre-established retention period, leaving a record of disposition; and
- the IRM Program demonstrably contributes to the achievement of Township administrative and service goals.