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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At its meeting on 26 February 2007, the Senior Management Team (SMT) requested that all offices review their retention schedules. SPICe responded to this by recommending that the Information Manager led a corporate approach and on 18 June 2007 presented SMT with a proposed methodology and timetable for undertaking this work:

- Develop policy, procedures and guidelines based on good practice
- Undertake a records audit of each office
- Develop a retention schedule for each office
- Appoint and train a network of Records Management Champions
- Speak to all staff, via team meetings, about the new policy and its implementation
- Assist each office, in an implementation day, to comply with the new policy

The records management project was approved by SMT and ran from August 2007 to March 2009. The retention schedules were approved by the relevant Head of Office and the Solicitors’ Office as well as being discussed with the National Archives of Scotland (NAS). The Directors' Group approved the policy and procedures.

The project ended six weeks behind schedule in order to accommodate staffing issues in the Broadcasting and Corporate Publications Offices. The work undertaken has proven to be an excellent start in developing and introducing good record-keeping practice in the Parliament. The vision and strategy have been set, and commendable progress has been made. However, although significant, the benefits achieved were only made through an intensive, one-off exercise. They will only be sustained if they are embedded into the Parliament as part of our business as usual activities and accepted as how we manage our documents and records.

The records management project:

- determined what good practice looked like for the Parliament, in line with external standards;
- established a basic awareness of the records management policy, procedures and guidance in all offices across the Parliament;
- ensured that the majority of staff gained a basic understanding of where to save electronic documents, reducing volume, duplication and out of date material and reducing the proliferation of information silos and insecure practices;
- trained a network of Records Management Champions, at least one per office, to be a local expert in record-keeping practices;
- removed 103 GB (15%) of ephemeral, out of date or non-essential information three months after implementation in all offices which improved the efficiency of our technology and made it easier for us to find things and respond to Freedom of Information requests.

Change of this scale takes time and ongoing management of change is required if we are to take advantage of the effort expended so far and avoid sliding back to where we started. This will require significant attention over the coming months and years. It will focus on further embedding the good practice via the network of Records Management Champions and must have top-down support if it is to succeed. The processes are still primarily manual and further work can readily be done to make the processes more automated and thus more sustainable.
Priorities for further action are:

- develop a phase 2 of the records management project to deliver further benefits;
- continue to embed the change over the next two years;
- work with offices and Records Management Champions to achieve greater benefits;
- consider small-scale incremental and proof-of-concept technological solutions to ensure sustainability of achievements and processes;
- walk the SPCB through its first annual file review and destruction cycle in summer recess 2010;
- develop processes to deliver continuous improvement in record keeping;
- develop a separate records store for electronic records.

Phase 1 of the records management project achieved a great deal but to sustain this and fully embed the change there are a number of activities we need to maintain and parts of the organisation we need to ‘push’ further. With good practices in place we have the opportunity to look at technologies which will automate the manual practices and free up staff time for other, more value-added activities.

A project initiation document for records management phase 2 has been prepared for OMG. OMG is asked to approve a continuation of the records management project to address some of the key recommendations contained within this report.

### 2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Document management        | • Corporate shared drive  
<p>|                               | • Corporate electronic document management system (long-term)                     |
|                               | • SPCB document and file naming convention                                         |
| 2. Management of records      | • Separate electronic records store/recordkeeping system                           |
|                               | • Identify vital records requiring fire-proof storage                               |
|                               | • Automated RM functionality                                                       |
| 3. Records Management Champions | • Recognise RM Champion role in appraisals                                          |
| 4. Personal drives            | • Impose personal drive limits                                                    |
|                               | • Target staff with excessive personal drives to encourage information transfer to corporate control |
| 5. Email management           | • Email archiving solution                                                        |
|                               | • Disable PSTs (personal folders) and other features that encourage bad practice   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Investigate alternatives to email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Retention schedules</td>
<td>• RM induction for all new starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a functional corporate retention schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Records reviews in 2010 recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SharePoint</td>
<td>• Information management policies for SharePoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Investigate the use of SharePoint to manage records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act (FOISA)</td>
<td>• Registering records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid duplication of FOISA requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Retention of electronic information</td>
<td>• Develop a policy to manage backup retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. User training and compliance</td>
<td>• Develop a routine training programme for all SPCB staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Portable storage devices (PSDs)</td>
<td>• Discontinue current practice of saving to DVDs/CD-ROMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of a PSD acceptable use policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The SPCB official record</td>
<td>• Electronic records should be regarded as the SPCB official record where the information is created electronically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SPCB photographs</td>
<td>• Investigate a strategic approach to managing photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Events management</td>
<td>• Offer assistance and investigate solutions to assist staff in managing events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. INTRODUCTION

The parliamentary and administrative records held by the SPCB form a unique and irreplaceable resource. The proper management of this resource is necessary in order to maintain effective and efficient internal business processes and to comply with statutory obligations including the requirements of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOISA) and the Public Records (Scotland) Act 1937. Good practice guidance on what to keep, how to keep it, what to destroy and when and how to destroy it needs to be maintained and followed in order to ensure compliance with these operational and legislative requirements.

4. BACKGROUND

The SMT minutes of 26 February 2007 record:

“It was requested that all offices review their retention schedules in early course, assisted by SPICe as appropriate. It would be important to dedicate sufficient time and attention to this exercise and to adhere closely to the revised schedules once agreed… email management would form an essential part of this exercise.”

Directors’ Group reviewed and approved version 1.0 of the revised Policy, procedures and guidance document to be implemented across the SPCB from November 2007.

In March 2008, following a successful pilot, SMT agreed to a project to develop and implement the policies and processes to embed good and consistent document, record and information management principles and practices into the SPCB.

It was envisaged that at the end of the project all SPCB offices would be following consistent and compliant policy and procedures, achieving efficiencies through better practices and would be working from accurate and up-to-date retention schedules.

5. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the project were to establish a document, record and information management culture that:

- follows good practice;
- treats information as a Scottish Parliament resource;
- ensures everyone is responsible for the information they hold;
- makes appropriate information accessible to others;
- keeps records of what we do;
- manages the information lifecycle from creation to disposition;
- is unified and consistent;
- is easily accessed and understood by staff;
• complies with standards, regulations and legislative requirements.

6. PROJECT METHODOLOGY

A corporate records management policy and procedures with accompanying guidance was developed based on industry standards and experience in other organisations. Each office was then guided through the same process over a four week period:

Appointment of Champions

Office Heads were asked to nominate Records Management Champions to lead on records management in their area and work with SPICe during and after the project.

Baseline survey

The Champion was asked to complete a multiple choice survey indicating the current status of a number of aspects of record-keeping in their office. This formed the measure of the office’s record-keeping practice at the outset of the project. The baseline survey was repeated a few weeks after implementation in each office to measure the adoption of the policy and good practice procedures.

Records survey

The Champion was also asked to complete a comprehensive records survey which identified all documents and records within each SPCB office. This established what records series the SPCB holds or needs to hold on an office-by-office basis.¹

Development and implementation of retention schedule

Following the identification of an office’s records series, each series was listed alongside the minimum time period for which the records should be retained, defined by legislative or regulatory requirements, standards and industry good practice. It also specified the means by which records should be disposed of. This retention schedule was approved by the Office Head and the Solicitors’ Office and quality assured by the National Archives of Scotland.²

Review of office shared drive

The project team reviewed each office’s shared drive structure and recommendations for improvement were made for the office to implement. Major changes were not recommended at this stage since a more corporate approach would be possible when all departments had been surveyed.

Training and Communication

¹ A records series is a group of like records that can be managed as a whole.

² The purpose of a retention schedule is to ensure an organisation retains only the information it requires for an appropriate period of time in order to balance the value of the information against the cost of storing and maintaining it.
Records Management Champions were trained in the new policy, procedures and guidance and briefed on their role during the implementation phase and thereafter. Staff were given a basic introduction to records management via a presentation to their office at team meetings.

**Implementation of new policy, procedures and guidance**

Each office was asked to set aside an appropriate amount of time to work on adopting the new policy through practical implementation. Several members of SPICe and the office’s Records Management Champion made themselves available on the office’s implementation day and guided staff through the procedures such as saving emails to shared areas, weeding out ephemera and duplicates, using the retention schedule and closing files.
7. PROJECT SUCCESS

The baseline survey questionnaire is to be found in annexe 1. All responses from Champions showed an improvement in record-keeping practices following the project and implementation of the new records management policy, procedures and guidance.

Application of retention schedule

Almost two thirds of champions believe that the project resulted in an improvement in how the office applied the retention schedule. Just over one third experienced no change. Approximately one third of champions recorded no change.

The project raised the profile of records management and of retention schedules. Ensuring all staff are familiar with the retention schedule is essential to ensure compliance with internal and external standards and legal requirements. Experience suggests that prior to the project many staff had no knowledge of the retention schedule or what it was intended for.

Application of records management policy

Over two thirds of champions experienced an improvement in the application of the new records management policy, procedures and guidance. Just under one third experienced no change.

Not only does the records management policy, procedures and guidance ensure that the SPCB is complying with the FOISA Code of practice on records management but it also acts as a useful reference tool. Offering clear and well thought out corporate guidance and procedures ensures that SPCB records are managed as important public records and creates an environment in which these assets can be managed effectively.

Application of naming conventions and version control guidance

Just over half of the champions have experienced an improvement in the application of standard naming conventions and the use of version control to manage documents. Just under half experienced no change. Of these some may already have felt that good naming conventions and version control were in use.

Good naming conventions are essential to our ability to find documents and assist the document creator and anyone wishing to find information to understand the content of the document without having to open it. Version control is necessary to engender trust in our information and know we have found the right version of a document.

Duplicate documents

Four fifths of champions have experienced an increase in the deletion of duplicate documents/convenience copies following implementation of the policy, procedures and guidance.

Storing information in more than one place can lead to confusion, duplication of effort and may result in information being held for longer than is required. Keeping out-of-date or
non-current information may mean we are failing to meet our obligations under legislation such as the Data Protection Act and could also harm the reputation of the SPCB. A culture where the duplication of documents is common increases the risk of information not being disposed of when it should be, according to the retention schedule.

Where to save documents

Just over half of the champions experienced an improvement in staff knowing where to file documents in the shared drive.

Consistent filing is necessary to ensure the record is stored in an easily accessible place. This cuts down on duplication and confusion over which is the most up to date version. It also ensures single searches can be made for information e.g. in response to FOI requests rather than having to run repeat searches over multiple locations. Storing information corporately means it is accessible even when colleagues are absent.

Not all offices had the optimum shared drive filing structure. Where there was an identified issue with an office shared drive, the project team made recommendations for improvement depending on the commitment from the office involved.

Finding information

Three eights of champions observed an improvement in the ability of staff to find information on the shared drive.

A number of changes contribute to our ability to find information. Standard naming conventions and standard file structures contribute to the ability to find information. It is essential that we are able to access our information without prolonged delay in order to satisfy information requests and to enable staff to concentrate on their core tasks.

Sharing information

One third of Champions experienced an improvement in sharing information with other offices following implementation of the revised policy, procedures and guidance.

Sharing information across offices will reduce email traffic and significantly reduce the duplication of information throughout the organisation significantly reducing the associated risks with information accuracy and version control.

Locating information for FOI requests

Almost half found the processes of locating information for FOI requests improved.

FOISA has changed the way the Parliament shares its information. It is essential that our information can be easily located in order to satisfy information requests timeously and efficiently.

Every office sends documents to other SPCB staff as attachments which creates duplication, increases the volume of material (reducing the effectiveness of our drive space) and creates confusion over correct versions. There has been a slight increase in using the hyperlink feature for internal office emails where the sender and the recipient are both on the same shared drive.
However, this feature is useless for communication with offices due to the silo structure of SPCB shared drives.
Prior to the RM project, the SPCB’s electronic information was increasing by approximately two fifths every year, exponentially. To date we have weeded out 12% of our overall document and record storage through removal of out of date, ephemeral and duplicate material. These figures are taken from August 2009, when not all offices had reached the same stage of implementation.
Figure 2: Average storage per person

We have done a fairly unsophisticated calculation of the average amount of data stored per employee which works out to be about 1.5 GB of electronic information (shared drive, personal drives and email) per person. 1.5 GB is the equivalent to 1, 132 copies of this paper which is 1.36 MB.

It is recommended that reasons for the peaks in some offices should be investigated and advice and assistance offered where appropriate. All offices could reduce their filing further and with ongoing attention and weeding the overall figure should stay relatively stable.
8. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section looks at the key findings of the project, through the surveys, discussion with Records Management Champions and staff and observation during implementation. It makes recommendations for next steps.

1. Document management

1.1. Silo-based network structure

1.1.1. There is a limited information-sharing culture across offices. Information is not viewed as a corporate resource or asset. Individuals and teams actively seek to prevent others from accessing their information.

In the short-term, it is recommended that an SPCB-wide review of shared drives is undertaken and a policy for creation and consolidation of shared drives be implemented with a view to creating a corporate-wide shared drive and strategy for educating staff.

1.1.2. The existing SPCB network drive environment has evolved to create a structure based on organisational silos which prevents sharing and helps to perpetuate the culture of individual ownership of information and a reluctance to share. The following diagram may serve to illustrate the problem.
Employee A works in Office A and therefore has full access to Office A information repositories. Other Office A colleagues do not have access to Employee A’s information stored in restricted areas e.g. Outlook, H:\ drives. They rely on Employee A sharing information with colleagues.

Employee A has no access to other information which is maintained by other offices. The only way in which Employee A can share information with colleagues from other offices is to use a collaboration tool such as SharePoint (currently limited in availability) or to create a separate network area with different permissions. In practice Employee A emails documents he wishes to share to other colleagues and they then save these to their personal space and/or office filing area. This quickly leads to significant duplication and version control issues when Employee A updates a document without alerting colleagues.

In the long-term, it is recommended that the SPCB embarks on a project to investigate the feasibility of implementing a corporate document filing system to allow wider access to corporate information, to avoid duplication, increase centralised control over documents and records and to ensure compliance with information legislation standards.

1.2. Inconsistent document retention practices

1.2.1. Prior to the project there was a limited culture of regular file weeding or stored records reviews. The new policy, procedures and guidance recommends that regular file weeding takes place on an individual basis and annual records reviews are done by each office. However, concerns have been raised about allocating time to records management tasks on top of tasks perceived as higher priority. Records management tasks are viewed as additional to day-to-day duties and are assigned a lower priority. There was therefore varying office commitment to implementation day activities across the SPCB.

It is recommended that the Information Manager develops activities to encourage ongoing file weeding and takes all offices on a walk-through of their records reviews during 2010 summer recess. It is also recommended that records management reviews be recorded in office plans and that Group Heads set individual objectives and show their support for this activity.

1.2.2. Staff are reluctant to dispose of documents under a ‘standard operating procedure’. There is a significant issue with staff retaining information in anticipation of FOISA requests. FOISA of itself does NOT require any record retention, only disclosure where retained. We are therefore making compliance with the legislation more costly and time-consuming with this approach.

It is recommended that guidance on retention of common documents e.g. team minutes etc be developed to provide staff with reassurance on the disposal of information not listed as records. This guidance should be signed off by senior management to encourage compliance. It also is recommended that the FOI training sources build in messages about record keeping requirements.
1.3. Inconsistent document naming

1.3.1. Document and file naming varies across the SPCB because there is no standard. Where naming conventions are required to enable systems (e.g. Bill templates) to function, staff are compliant with the rules in place. The absence of a corporate standard for naming documents and files will inhibit any future move to share information across the SPCB and also impacts on information retrieval.

It is recommended that an SPCB document and file naming convention be developed and introduced.

1.4. Unnecessary duplication

1.4.1. Some processes integral to the operation of the Scottish Parliament require duplication of documents, either within or across processes. For example, PQs – the existing PQs process and system requires duplication in order to successfully function. This results in inefficiencies in processes, inefficient, labour-intensive and costly storage and retrieval of documents and allows for a margin of error in the process.

It is recommended that the Information Manager continues to address inefficiencies in processes through the IMS programme.

1.5. Inconsistent versioning and draft control

1.5.1. Version control is important for documents that undergo a lot of revision and redrafting and is particularly important for electronic documents because they can easily be changed by a number of different users. Version control has not been universally adopted and there are examples of significant drafts being routinely overwritten or deleted following publication of the final version.

It is recommended that the Information Manager continues to address versioning and draft issues with Champions to encourage change in practices. It is also recommended that technological solutions be explored and that versioning is switched on in applications supporting the function e.g. SharePoint.

1.6. Corporate templates

1.6.1. Corporate templates are outdated and not fit for purpose. Some offices have therefore developed office templates to meet local needs which would not necessarily conform to corporate standards.

It is recommended that corporate templates with required metadata are developed and made available to all SPCB staff. All other default Microsoft templates should then be deleted.
1.7. Shared drive issues

1.7.1. The process of storing and retrieving documents is labour-intensive and costly.

It is recommended that the SPCB should begin work to develop and implement a document management system. In the first instance, it is recommended that a corporate shared drive be introduced.

1.7.2. There is an outdated corporate structure in the electronic environment as a result of several organisational changes which makes updating structures difficult and labour intensive. Information retrieval is also adversely affected.

It is recommended that the SPCB implements a functional\(^3\) approach to a corporate shared drive to ensure that future structural changes have limited impact on the electronic environment.

1.7.3. Shared drives have evolved in an informal manner with minimal structure or planning. Folders with titles such as New Folder or John Smith's Folder are not uncommon. These folder names convey no indication of content, making locating information difficult.

The common problems that shared drives can cause include:

- difficulty finding and retrieving information that is known to exist;
- records are difficult to authenticate if they are only stored in a shared drive (an authentic record is one that can be proven and trusted to be what it purports to be and to have been created, used, transmitted or held by an organisation or person to whom these actions have been attributed);
- documents in shared drives do not provide reliable evidence of actions;
- shared drives do not provide any recordkeeping functionality.

It is recommended that consideration should be given to developing a corporate shared drive and, in the long-term to:

- develop a document naming standard that is used by each office;
- develop policies and procedures that provide structure and consistency for the management of a corporate shared drive;
- identify appropriate processes and controls for the deletion of information from the corporate shared drive;
- audit the corporate shared drive on a regular basis to ensure that the policies and procedures are being followed.

1.7.4. Shared drives are not recordkeeping systems. They do not have the functionality to serve as a recordkeeping system:

\(^{3}\) A functional structure sorts content according to its function and not where it sits in the organisational hierarchy.
• documents stored on shared drives can be edited or deleted by anyone who has access to the drive;
• there is no version control and a document can be out of date with no link to the updated version
• there is no audit trail that can identify who has modified a document;
• properties fields are rarely populated with metadata;
• there is no context to the documents.

It is recommended that the SPCB implements a strategy to ensure that public records stored on shared network drives are capable of being declared as records or captured and kept within a separate recordkeeping system. Please refer to 2. Management of records.

1.8. Protective markings and descriptors

1.8.1. The existing protective markings policy is lengthy and not easily accessible. Nor is it universally adhered to or understood in the new FOISA environment. In addition, the current electronic environment does not support the necessary access restrictions based on markings.

It is recommended that the Information Manager liaises with Security staff to develop and implement procedures for the use of protective markings.

2. Management of records

The guiding principle of records management is to ensure that information is available when and where it is needed, in an organised and efficient manner, and in a well maintained environment. The National Archives of Scotland\(^4\) recommends that organisations ensure that their records are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authentic</th>
<th>It must be possible to prove that records are what they purport to be and who created them, by keeping a record of their management through time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>Records must accurately reflect the transactions that they document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Records must be readily available when needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Records must be sufficient in content, context and structure to reconstruct the relevant activities and transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>Records must document the complete range of the SPCB’s business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td>Records must comply with any record keeping requirements resulting from legislation, audit rules and other relevant regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) The National Archives of Scotland acts as the official archive of the Scottish Parliament.
Effective
Records must be maintained for specific purposes and the information contained in them must meet those purposes. Records will be identified and linked to the business process to which they are related

Secure
Records must be securely maintained to prevent unauthorised access, alteration, damage or removal. They must be stored in a secure environment, the degree of security reflecting the sensitivity and importance of the content

### 2.1. Principles of good records management

#### 2.1.1. Authentic:
SPCB records can be edited throughout their lifecycle. Limited audit trail capabilities within current systems means it will be difficult to prove that a record has not been amended since declaration. ISO 15489, the record-keeping standard, states that ‘the integrity of a record refers to its being complete and unaltered’.

It is recommended that the SPCB investigates the possibility of implementing a separate records store to transfer electronic records to when they have been closed e.g. a read-only network drive or records management system, accessed by staff and managed by the Information Manager.

#### 2.1.2. Accurate:
The SPCB policy, procedures and guidance have ensured that SPCB staff have clear guidance on the management of records.

It is recommended that the policy, procedures and guidance should be reviewed regularly to ensure staff have up-to-date guidance to follow.

#### 2.1.3. Accessible:
There is no central records repository for electronic records. Records are spread throughout existing shared drives with access restrictions.

It is recommended that records are stored in a central location to improve access and management (refer to 2.1.1).

#### 2.1.4. Complete:
Drafts of significant documents which form records are sometimes incorrectly treated as routine drafts and destroyed when a final version has been agreed. Drafts can be as valuable as final versions of documents and any draft which records significant decisions or changes in approach should be kept as part of the official record. Routinely disposing of drafts may result in an incomplete record of the decision making process being kept.

It is recommended that the SPCB enforces version control where more than one version of a document is created. Drafts should be reviewed when records are declared (closed) and not upon publication of the final version to ensure that valuable drafts are captured.

#### 2.1.5. Comprehensive:
The SPCB retention schedule has ensured that all SPCB records have been identified and guidance on their management produced.
It is recommended that retention schedules are reviewed triennially to ensure new records series are identified and added. In the short-term it is recommended that the Information Manager embarks on a mop-up exercise to ensure the SPCB retention schedule is complete and to compile a single corporate retention schedule from the separate office schedules.

2.1.6. Compliant: The SPCB records retention schedule has ensured that SPCB staff have clear guidance on what is required to meet all external and internal requirements.

It is recommended that the SPCB investigates the steps that still need to be taken in order to ensure the SPCB complies with legislation, audit rules and other relevant regulations, first aligning to then complying with ISO 15489.

2.1.7. Effective: The SPCB retention schedule ensures that records are kept for specific purposes.

It is recommended that retention schedules are reviewed triennially to ensure new records series are identified and added.

2.1.8. Secure: The current network shared drive environment is not a secure environment for the storage of electronic records. The transfer of paper records to records storage is an adequate solution for the long-term storage of paper records.

It is recommended that electronic records are stored in a central location to improve access and management (refer to 2.1.1). It is recommended that a review of paper record storage arrangements be carried out and appropriate security mechanisms be introduced where necessary, eg fire-proof safe for important and irreplaceable records.

2.2. Electronic environment

2.2.1. There is variable practice within the SPCB for keeping electronic records and limited technological tools to support processes. Electronic records are maintained alongside documents which are of no long-term value. There is currently no controlled method of managing electronic records in a central system. The project introduced manual processes to declare and manage records. However, the manual process does not offer sufficient control over the management of records from creation through to disposal.

It is recommended that the SPCB investigates technological solutions which would allow automated record keeping processes to be introduced, including:

- creating document templates with embedded metadata e.g. disposition date;
- using read only drives or recordkeeping systems to store records and maintain their authenticity;
- closing or disabling non-authorised storage locations (e.g. C:\ drives);
• creating a business classification scheme which will include information security and access governance.

2.2.2. The current electronic environment does not allow for a Records Manager to manage the organisations records collectively according to centrally controlled policies.

It is recommended that the SPCB implements a system which allows for improved management of records separately from documents e.g. read only drives where records can be transferred.

2.2.3. It is unclear if all SPCB vital records have been completely identified due to staff unfamiliarity with what constitutes a record.

It is recommended that the Information Manager works with Champions to develop a detailed list of vital records the SPCB should consider preserving to ensure business continuity. Electronic records that are identified as being vital to the running of the SPCB should be backed up and held within off-site storage in a secure environment and tagged for early recovery in the event of an incident. Similarly, vital paper records should be stored in a secure environment off-site or in a fire-proof safe on-site.

2.2.4. The possibility of electronic information becoming unreadable due to technical obsolescence (with legal, reputational or financial consequences) is a risk. In 2007, the Japanese Government faced a crisis due to poor record-keeping. Pension records created in 1997 were not properly maintained and handled, and by 2007, 50 million pension records could not be linked to individuals who had been making payments. The Prime Minister announced that, ‘The careless management of public documents, such as pension records, is absolutely unacceptable. We will consider a fundamental review… for managing administrative records and will consider their legislation, and furthermore, we will improve the system for preserving public records’.

It is recommended that the Information Manager identifies information held that needs to be readable beyond 5-7 years and BIT use this information to develop a policy for the long-term management of such material. It is further recommended that the use of CD-ROMS and other such media for storage purposes be stopped, implementing this through policy and disabling CD-ROM drives.

2.2.5. A major part of the SPCB’s business is carried out electronically. The current approach to records management is inefficient, time consuming and difficult to manage and leaves the SPCB open to risk.

Issues with managing electronic records manually:

No audit trail

---

5 Managing information risk, HM Government, 2008 p. 23
No automated version control
Limited security
Duplication
Reduces ability to share information across the SPCB
Staff resource required to manage records
Increased business risk
Limited centralised control

It is recommended that the SPCB investigates technological solutions which will enable the SPCB to meet its legislative obligations.

2.3. Paper records

2.3.1. Unfamiliarity with records management principles and what constitutes a record has led to non-records being sent to off-site storage and treated as records resulting in non-important information being maintained in a secure environment with the related costs of storage and retrieval.

It is recommended that the Information Manager carries out an exercise to review all records held in offsite storage and, with business area co-operation, review and assess all records against the revised retention schedule.

2.3.2. Security of records in transit to and from records storage is not 100% efficient. Storage boxes are temporarily stored at the entrance to the Records Store due to key access restrictions. Recent events concerning NHS records being left in corridors in an unsecured environment highlights the requirement to ensure that records are maintained in a secure environment, not only in offices and in the store but also during transit.

It is recommended that the Information Manager investigates ways in which the security of records can be improved, including arranging for swipe access to the records management store to ensure records are not left unsecured.

2.3.3. Important paper records e.g. signed Acts of the Scottish Parliament and original leases are not stored in a suitably secure environment. These records are currently stored in standard flexi form filing cabinets.

It is recommended that the Information Manager arrange for non-active important records to be transferred to off-site storage and for a fire-proof safe conforming to international standards BS ISO 15489-1 to be procured in order to store vital paper records required to be kept on-site and installed in the Records Store. It is also recommended that it be reviewed in order to ensure that the store meets the required international record-keeping standards.

3. Records Management Champions
3.1. Recognition of Champions’ duties and responsibilities

3.1.1. There is no formal recognition of the role of RM Champion. Champions who are either nominated or volunteered are currently expected to carry out their duties in addition to their normal workload.

It is recommended that Champions receive recognition of their role in performance appraisals and their performance as Champion is appraised according to corporate guidelines.

4. Personal drives

4.1. Private storage area

4.1.1. Personal drives (H:\ drives) are intended to provide SPCB staff with an area to store information of a personal nature e.g. performance management documents, private documents and working drafts not yet ready for wider consumption. Access is therefore restricted to the staff member, except in exceptional circumstances. This drive is not, and should not be used to store corporate information. The use of personal drives to store corporate information is commonplace throughout the SPCB. Email is also saved to individual H:\ drives and accessed via Outlook. The widespread storage of corporate information in personal drives is a significant risk to the SPCB since it renders information irretrievable for FOISA and other enquiries.

It is recommended that personal drive space should be limited to 0.5 GB. 0.5 GB is the equivalent of enough space to save 380 copies of this document.

Limiting personal drive space and enforcing the policy will ensure that all corporate information is saved to a corporate area which is subject to corporate policies covering retention and disposal. This will also improve the SPCB’s compliance with FOISA by ensuring all corporate information can be accessed and reviewed in order to satisfy information requests [reliant on recommendation 5.1.1].

4.2. Reliance on personal drives

4.2.1. At the start of the project the total personal drive size across all offices was 366 GB compared to 336 GB for shared drives. This suggests that there is a widespread over-reliance on personal, non-centralised storage of corporate information. By August 2009, and following implementation of the policy, procedures and guidance and retention schedules, personal drives were 245 GB, a reduction of 91 GB (25 %). 108 SPCB employees’ personal drives exceed 1 GB, the largest being 17 GB which is the equivalent of the Finance Office shared drive or 7 Allowances shared drives. Fifty one personal drives exceed 2 GB.

It is recommended that staff with excessively large personal drives be targeted to transfer corporate information to a corporate area where it can be managed according to corporate policies. Staff personal drives should be limited to 0.5 GB and this may be phased in as drive sizes reduce.
5. Email management

5.1. Microsoft Outlook used as a storage tool

5.1.1. Microsoft Outlook is primarily used by SPCB staff as a storage tool when in fact it is a method of delivery. Outlook is used to store emails of long-term value because it is quicker and easier to use and search than the preferred procedure. Saving email to a shared drive may create a better corporate record but it is a time-consuming manual process and does not offer the same searching.

It is recommended that the SPCB investigates the implementation of an email archiving solution to improve email management. An archiving system will automate archiving of all email after a set period which complies with corporate retention policies. This will ensure email is stored in a more stable filing system, ensuring that the content is managed by corporate policies. Email should be accessible by the originator and authorised staff.

5.1.2. Outlook features which encourage poor practice are freely available for staff to use without restriction e.g. auto-archiving, PST (personal folder) creation.

It is recommended that Outlook features which encourage poor practice should be deactivated, encouraging staff to maintain email according to corporate policies. This should only be implemented if an email archiving or similar solution is in place.

5.1.3. A significant number of staff rely heavily on PSTs for information storage - an unmanageable, de-centralised black hole. A culture change project is therefore required in order to ensure staff are comfortable moving away from using email as storage location.

It is recommended that staff using PSTs should be permitted to continue using them with the aim of gradual reduction, leading to removal. Staff not using PSTs should have the ability to create them disabled. This should only be implemented if an email archiving or similar solution is in place.

5.2. Outlook as a communication tool

5.2.1. Email is commonly used as the major means of communication both within the SPCB and with external organisations. Consequently, there can be an assumption that using email is as informal as using the telephone. The creation and sending of an email may create a record attributable to the SPCB. It is important to educate staff to this effect and to encourage formal communications.

It is recommended that the SPCB uses an auto archiving email system to move email to a controlled area. This will act as an incentive for staff to dispose of informal communications prior to archiving which should lead to formal communications being archived and managed. Encourage the use of Outlook features – ‘personal’, ‘low priority’ etc.
5.2.2. There is a reliance on using email for communication that does not need to be recorded formally.

It is recommended that the SPCB investigates the use of an instant messenger or real-time text-based communication solution as an alternative to using email for low-level communication that does not need to be recorded.

5.3. Restricted access to corporate information

5.3.1. A significantly large percentage of corporate information is currently inaccessible for FOISA. Approx 65% of staff use PSTs within Outlook to store corporate information. This information can only be accessed by the individual employee and is therefore not managed centrally. This opens up the SPCB to risk. Information may be maintained in a PST longer than the original record is maintained in the shared drive. Also, information stored in personal areas may not be captured when responding to information requests resulting in the SPCB failing to comply with information access legislation.

It is recommended that the practice of saving corporate information to areas in a closed environment (Outlook) should be discouraged and where possible, prevented. In consultation with BIT, the Information Manager should develop a strategy to eliminate the use of PSTs by SPCB staff.

5.4. Fragmented email guidance and policy

5.4.1. The current SPCB advice on e-mail management and retention is fragmented and does not follow best practice. Staff do not always consider properly whether to delete email or save them to a shared system. In light of the current information legislative environment and current good practice there is a requirement to change the current culture of email management in the SPCB.

It is recommended that existing email guidance for staff be replaced with a joint BIT-SPiCe guidance document incorporating accepted recommendations from this report.

5.5. Technological restrictions

5.5.1. The Policy, procedures and guidance advises staff to save email of long-term value to a shared area. The current IT setup does not allow for this to be a smooth and intuitive process. Therefore, it has yet to be universally adopted. Emails can be a medium which contain a great deal of data, information and knowledge but in a format which renders this inaccessible.

It is recommended that the SPCB investigates integrated desk top tools which will allow staff to search across all public folders and to investigate tools to assist with capturing email to the central, shared storage area.
5.6. Mailbox limits

5.6.1. Staff mailboxes are currently limited to 100 MB. However, there is little point in enforcing this as users can create PSTs which offer unlimited space to transfer email to. It is commonplace for staff to move every email from their inbox when the limit is reached to a PST without carrying out any weeding.

In addition to removing the ability to create PSTs, it is recommended that the existing Outlook mailbox limit should be reviewed to ensure that staff have enough space to maintain current email correspondence without the use of PSTs.

5.6.2. Email is the holder and medium of so much information that nobody likes deleting old messages. Many staff use their email system as a personal filing cabinet.

It is recommended that the SPCB implements an email archiving solution to automatically archive email into a corporately controlled area. Treating email as a corporate resource will assist with the development of a culture that uses email as a formal communication tool.

5.7. PSTs (personal folders)

5.7.1. The uncontrolled proliferation of PST files poses risks for the SPCB beyond IT. Organisational amnesia: every email saved to user PST files takes a piece of the SPCB’s knowledge with it. If the PST file owner leaves, there is a risk that the information in the PST file will never be brought back under SPCB control.

Further to recommendation 5.3.1, it is recommended that the SPCB prevents the use of PSTs and enforces mailbox limits. Automated archiving to a corporately managed area should be considered.

5.7.2. PSTs are also subject to the risk of corruption. There is an issue with PSTs suffering from corruption as they near the 2 GB marker.

It is recommended that the SPCB prevents the use of PSTs and uses an email archiving solution to ensure email is managed centrally.

5.7.3. No oversight: information in PSTs does not get stored and disposed of according to consistent SPCB policies. This can have significant legal implications.

It is recommended that the SPCB considers corporate retention period for emails not declared as records, e.g. archive all email after 3 months, delete archived email after a set period. Emails within the archive should be accessible by the originator & authorised staff to satisfy information requests. Given the requirements of FOI, opening up access to corporate email will make answering FOI requests easier and more effective.
5.7.4. Legal liabilities: if the SPCB needs to keep a formal archive of emails sent and received to comply with regulations, PST files represent a gap in the record. An email stored in a properly managed email server can be a vital defence, but how do you know what’s on 500 different ad hoc PST files? Even without a legal dimension, the inability to locate a critical email quickly could be disastrous.

**It is recommended that the SPCB prevents the use of PSTs and uses an email archiving solution to ensure email is managed centrally.**

5.8. Enforced duplication

5.8.1. Staff have no option other than to create duplicate copies when sending documents outside their own office. Email attachments are therefore the primary method of sending documents between staff in the SPCB. The high reliance on PSTs also suggests that attachments are very likely to be saved there. Unnecessary duplication is the accepted culture.

**It is recommended that the existing silo-based drive structure be replaced with an SPCB-wide open shared system (with the necessary restrictions to sensitive material applied) to permit staff to send links to documents, reducing duplication.** It is also recommended that the overall information hierarchy be considered and the feasibility of placing key corporate documents on the intranet be investigated.

5.9. The cost of email

5.9.1. SPCB staff rely on email for both essential and nonessential tasks. Our overreliance on email not only creates unnecessary information for us to manage but also contributes to the information overload staff may experience in any working day. Loughborough University research suggests that 70% of emails in the workplace are reacted to within 6 seconds of them arriving and 85% are reacted to within 2 minutes of arriving\(^6\). The research proposes it takes employees on average 64 seconds to recover from an email interrupt (any distraction that makes an employee stop his/her planned activity to respond to the interrupt’s initiator) and return to work at the same rate at which they left it. In the worst case scenario, it is possible to have 96 email interrupts per working day. If an employee is interrupted every 5 minutes, then this would only leave 3.5 minutes before the next interrupt.\(^7\) The Loughborough University research also proposes that only 15% of email received needs to be actioned and that 85% could be communicated in another way.

---

\(^6\) *Reducing the effect of email interruptions on employees*, Thomas Jackson, Ray Dawson and Darren Wilson, 2003. Available: URL [https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/handle/2134/484](https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/handle/2134/484) [accessed 17 August 2009]

It is recommended that the SPCB investigates how to reduce our reliance on email and how we could benefit from introducing methods for reducing email interrupt effects.

6. Retention schedules

6.1. Profile of retention schedules

6.1.1. The Records management project raised the profile of records management and more specifically of retention schedules. Retention schedules, prior to the project, were rarely consulted by staff. Some offices had not been complying with retention schedules, leaving the SPCB open to risk. Records management ensures information can be accessed easily, can be destroyed routinely when no longer needed, and enables the SPCB not only to function on a day to day basis, but also to fulfil legal and financial requirements. Failing to manage records according to retention schedules could result in the SPCB being unable to be held accountable for its actions.

It is recommended that records management be introduced to SPCB induction programmes. The inclusion of records management in induction training programmes for all new staff is a requirement of the FOISA Code of Practice on Records Management. It is also recommended that the retention schedules be made easier to use with the creation of a single, corporate schedule combining web retention if possible. The feasibility of having a searchable database of retention schedules on the intranet should be investigated.

6.1.2. The failure to review and weed records on a regular basis according to the retention schedule could result in the organisation maintaining records longer than required and reduces the opportunity to identify issues requiring attention. Office-wide reviews of records have not been routinely carried out.

It is recommended that the Information Manager works with offices to plan records reviews during the 2010 summer recess.

6.1.3. The project was limited to unstructured information created outside databases and software packages. There are issues with SPCB databases storing information beyond the retention period of similar information in document form.

It is recommended that all future systems developed by BIT should go through a records management checklist, as part of the information management assurance, and should conform to the policy, procedures and guidance.

7. SharePoint

SharePoint is a browser-based collaboration and document management platform from Microsoft.
7.1. Document management

7.1.1. Although SharePoint is not currently being used as a document management tool, it is being deployed as a collaborative environment for ad hoc projects and teams within the Parliament and no strategy governs its roll out. The increased use of SharePoint means that more and more documents and records are being transferred to a SharePoint environment. This is creating a further silo for corporate information and separating it from the main body of corporate information. In effect, SharePoint has become an unmanaged (from a records management perspective) alternative document management solution. There are currently 10,772 documents saved to the SPCB’s SharePoint system (April 2009).

BIT is using SharePoint as the default document store when a requirement exists to share documents across teams. There is no policy concerning this from a document management perspective and there is a significant issue that staff are being asked to use unfamiliar software with little or no training.

It is recommended that an information management strategy for SharePoint be developed corporately. Policies should be developed and signed off to ensure all information on SharePoint is controlled according to corporate standards.

7.2. Planning

7.2.1. Limited structure and detailed planning prior to development of SharePoint sites is of concern from a records management perspective and may lead to a replication of existing problems. Lack of control and standardisation is leading to replication of current issues with the existing shared drives.

It is recommended that work should be undertaken to define standards for document libraries to ensure consistent standards are applied to all information across SharePoint sites. It is also recommend that BIT develop training for staff required to access SharePoint document libraries.

7.2.2. Where SharePoint is being used to manage documents, SharePoint’s document management features have not always been fully utilised as standard e.g. version and auditing control.

It is recommended that SPCB agrees a configuration for SharePoint which supports our policies and that a minimum version control and audit control should be mandatory on all SharePoint applications.

7.3. Managing records

7.3.1. Some records e.g. Private Committee Papers are no longer managed in shared network drives. The adoption of SharePoint technologies has added an extra medium in which it is necessary to manage documents and records.

It is recommended that the SPCB investigates the possible solutions to managing records in the SharePoint Committee Agenda System in the first
instance in order to develop an understanding of SharePoint functionality which may feed future developments.

8. Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act (FOISA)

8.1. Compliance with s60 of the FOISA Code of Practice on records management

8.1.1. An authority’s records management strategy should contain the following elements for all records:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code of practice required elements</th>
<th>SPCB situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A records management policy</td>
<td>The current SPCB policy was signed off in March 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements for registration and tracking of records</td>
<td>There is no system for registering or tracking electronic records. The off-site storage service provides basic registration and tracking of paper records (at box level) but this only captures paper records sent to storage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines on when records should be closed to further additions</td>
<td>The current SPCB policy provides sufficient guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements for appraising the authority’s records and for deciding their long-term future</td>
<td>The current SPCB policy details such arrangements. Appraisal is currently undertaken by business areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A selection policy</td>
<td>The current SPCB policy provides guidance on records selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal schedules for each business area</td>
<td>The SPCB retention schedule offers guidance for business areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A permanent record of any records destroyed</td>
<td>There is no automated system in place to log the disposal of records. The project introduced manual processes which act as a short-term solution requiring staff to manually log destruction of electronic records. Paper records destroyed offsite are recorded at box level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate storage for current, semi-current and historical records</td>
<td>Electronic records are stored alongside documents in the shared drive and not in a records management system/area specifically designed for such a purpose. Current and semi-current paper records are stored in offices before being sent to storage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A link to the authority’s business continuity plan</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is recommended that arrangements for registration and tracking of records should be developed and implemented to ensure that the SPCB fully complies with the FOISA Code of Practice on Records Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code of practice required elements</th>
<th>SPCB recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A records management policy</td>
<td>It is recommended that the SPCB policy, procedures and guidance be revised following project experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements for registration and tracking of records</td>
<td>It is recommended that the SPCB investigates electronic solutions to allow registration and tracking of electronic records separate from documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines on when records should be closed to further additions</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Information Manager continues to work to embed new procedures in the SPCB culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements for appraising the authority’s records and for deciding their long-term future</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Information Manager develops central appraisal guidelines using the experience of the HPT records project and continues to work to embed new procedures in the SPCB culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A selection policy</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Information Manager develop a more detailed selection policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention schedules for each business area</td>
<td>It is recommended that the retention schedules are reviewed triennially to ensure they continue to be fit for purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A permanent record of any records destroyed</td>
<td>It is recommended that the SPCB investigates ways to automate the current manual process of logging destruction of electronic records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate storage for current, semi-current and historical records</td>
<td>It is recommended that the SPCB investigates implementing an electronic management solution which will allow for the management of electronic records separately from documents. It is recommended this is done in conjunction with a lifecycle review to minimise the cost of managing each record type. It is also recommended that a review of the on-site records store be undertaken to ensure the store meets internal and external standards for the storage of paper records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A link to the authority’s business continuity plan</td>
<td>It is recommended that additional work be carried out to identify vital records and their required management to support business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2. Reliance on manual processes

8.2.1. Rigorous manual, staff-based processes are required to ensure compliance with Freedom of Information legislation. FOISA and records management staff have limited access to corporate information outwith their own office and therefore are not in a position to investigate information requests themselves.

It is recommended that a corporate shared drive be established in the short term and increased access to SPCB information across all networks and technology be investigated in order to improve information searching efficiency.

8.3. Duplication of FOISA requests

8.3.1. The majority of offices are failing to use the FOI database as originally intended. The database should be the source for all information relating to FOI requests. Due to the restricted access to the FOI database, offices are maintaining duplicate copies of documents concerning requests in shared drives. These documents are not controlled centrally and cannot therefore be managed by the FOI Specialist and may also lead to information being maintained longer than necessary.

It is recommended that all offices make efforts to move all information of long-term value to the FOI database and dispose of all duplicate information stored to local shared drives. When a request has been satisfied, all local copies of FOI request documents should be deleted.

8.3.2. The Allowances offices maintains a separate FOISA database which replicates the information contained in the central database with the addition of Allowances-specific information. These records are not controlled centrally and cannot therefore be managed by the FOI Specialist and may also lead to information being maintained longer than necessary.

It is recommended that the Allowances Office’s requirements be captured by the Enquiries database project currently underway to ensure that the FOI database meets the needs of the Allowances Office. The Allowances FOI database should be deleted.

8.3.3. FOI documents are currently saved to a closed area of the SPICe shared drive with access limited to FOI Action Officers and Decision Takers. This practice encourages duplication, has version control implications and increases email traffic with attachments being sent across offices.

It is recommended that a shared area, accessible to all SPCB staff, be created to store FOI related information. This will reduce the need to save duplicate documents and help a new culture of information sharing develop.

9. Retention of electronic information (back ups)
9.1. Current policy

9.1.1. The fact that information is potentially available on backup tapes up to a year or more after it is deleted from live systems poses a risk to the SPCB. Although the Scottish Information Commissioner does not currently expect public bodies to retrieve information that requires the skills of an IT specialist\(^8\) to satisfy information requests, the UK Information Commissioner considers that ‘information in a deleted file or in a backup, whether a server, disc or tape, may be regarded as being held by a public authority for the purpose of the FOIA’\(^9\).

It is recommended that a policy be developed with BIT to ensure that backup information is not retained longer than necessary and to ensure the SPCB meets its legislative requirements.

10. User training and compliance

10.1. Training programme

10.1.1. The success of the records management policy, procedures and guidance will depend on its effective use by the SPCB staff creating and using its records. The first step towards ensuring staff are aware of the policy, procedures and guidance has already been taken through the widespread consultation exercise and implementation sessions held in each office and the appointment of Records Management Champions.

It is recommended that a training programme be developed to ensure the new procedures are fully understood and complied with by new staff and frequent training programmes should be developed to ensure staff are familiar with policy and procedures. It is recommended that the Records Management Champions be developed as a group in order to give them a sense of purpose, cohesion and support.

11. Portable storage devices (PSDs)

11.1. The SPCB does not have a policy concerning the use of PSDs.

11.1.1. Some business areas rely on using CD and DVD-ROMS to store information. Such media is not sustainable and not subject to centralised control. The use of such media is not good information management practice as they are vulnerable to accidental damage or destruction and they are not digitally sustainable through technological change i.e. they may not be readable in a few years’ time.


It is recommended that current practice of relying on information stored on CD/DVDs and the use of CD/DVDs should be discontinued in areas should be limited. Corporate servers should be used instead, which are regularly backed up and proofed as far as is possible against disaster.

11.1.2. Recent cases such as the USB key containing the personal information of 12 million people from a UK Government computer system that was lost in a pub car park act as a reminder to the risks of failing to control the flow of information. Such cases vividly illustrate the problem with the loss of data held on PSDs.

It is recommended that a PSD acceptable usage policy be developed and that the possibility of using hardware and software controls to alleviate any risk from PSDs should be considered.

12. The official SPCB record

12.1. Master record

12.1.1. There is a common misconception that records always exist in paper form. The vast majority of records held by the SPCB are created and maintained electronically. The master record should be maintained in its original format e.g. paper or electronic and should only be maintained in another format should the original format be amended in any way e.g. where handwritten notes are added to a printout.

It is recommended that electronic records should be regarded as the SPCB official record of use where the information is created electronically, unless there is a specific requirement to maintain a hardcopy e.g. signed contract. Where a record exists in electronic form, it should be maintained in electronic form and not printed and kept in hardcopy.

12.2. Print contractor

12.2.1. Offices have been maintaining early versions of publications published by the print contractor as records, leading to unnecessary duplication.

It is recommended that the SPCB treats final print contractor copies as the master copies of all publications e.g. Committee reports published by RR Donnelley should be maintained as the record, not the local copy maintained by the Committee. It is also recommended that any new contract arrangements for print contractors should include requirements for records storage and access.

12.3. Other contractors

12.3.1. The SPCB has a number of contractors both on-site and off-site who may be creating SPCB records in the course of their business.

It is recommended that the SPCB explores the existence of such records and, if required, creates a policy and procedures to secure such records in line with our records management policy. It is also recommended that new contracts be set up with the policy embedded in the process.
13. SPCB photographs

13.1. Duplication

13.1.1. Access to the Media Office database is restricted. Staff outside the Media Office are therefore supplied with copies of images (which are often saved to personal drives). Increased devolution of web publication has increased the demand for photographs and led to more duplication of image files, which are invariably large in size.

It is recommended that a strategic approach to managing photographs should be investigated to enable all staff requiring photographs for business use to have the ability to access and search a central repository of images maintained by the Parliament photographers. This repository should also manage the copyright aspects of each image.

14. Events management


14.1.1. The Events Team suffer from information overload and do not have sufficient technology to support their processes. The office therefore relies on Outlook as a storage tool and replication of material between team members as well as between software packages in order to ensure successful completion of their tasks.

It is recommended that specific assistance be offered to the Events and Exhibitions Team with a view to making recommendations regarding how they can better meet the requirements of the records management policy whilst maintaining effective working practices.

9. NEXT STEPS

Phase 1 of the records management project achieved a great deal but to sustain this and fully embed the change there are a number of activities we need to maintain and parts of the organisation we need to ‘push’ further. Phase 1 was focused on achieving good and consistent working practices across the whole organisation. With good practices in place we have the opportunity to look at technologies which will automate the manual practices and free up staff time for other, more value-added activities. Phase 1 also highlighted areas where the records management policy was not fully integrated into our organisational processes.

A project initiation document for records management phase 2 has been prepared for OMG. OMG is asked to approve a continuation of the records management project to address some of the key recommendations contained within this report. It is quite likely that a further phase 3 will be scoped in time to address issues which are not timely to tackle in phase 2.
### ANNEXE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>[please insert your name]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office:</td>
<td>[please insert your office]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>[please insert the date]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9. Existing practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 a) On a scale from 1 to 6 (1 being not very well, 6 being extremely well), how well does your office apply the existing retention schedule?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 b) On a scale from 1 to 6 (1 being not very well, 6 being extremely well), how well does your office apply the existing records management policy?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 c) On a scale from 1 to 6 (1 being not very well, 6 being extremely well), how well does your office apply consistent naming conventions &amp; version control?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 d) On a scale from 1 to 6 (1 being Disagree, 6 being Agree), how accurate are the following statements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- staff routinely delete duplicate documents</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- staff know where to file documents in the shared drive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- staff experience difficulty finding information in the shared drive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- staff share information with other offices</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- staff find it difficult to locate information for FOI requests</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 e) For the majority, do you email documents within the Scottish Parliament as attachments or hyperlinks?</td>
<td>Attachments / Hyperlinks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>