Welcome to our third Information Governance (IG) survey report which reveals trends, particularly within the Australian and New Zealand region. Our 2021 IG survey engaged 338 industry professionals and highlights the status, priorities and challenges of information governance for organisations.

The IG Report highlights that implementing and maintaining an IG framework is the most important priority for organisations, with the three main enterprise-wide drivers of IG projects identified as:

- external regulatory, compliance and or legal obligations;
- good business management; and
- internal technology restructuring or transition.

Since our last survey, there was a notable increase in external events, such as data breach, legal proceedings and investigations driving IG projects. However fewer participants indicated that privacy regulatory changes, such as the GDPR, CCPA, New Zealand’s Privacy Act 2020 and Australia’s NDB Scheme had been a driver of their current IG projects.

Nearly two-thirds of the respondents said their organisation uses a formal IG framework with policies and procedures, which was a substantial increase on 2019. Almost three-quarters of the respondents’ organisations have IG projects underway or planned in the next year, with over a third indicating they are expecting to increase their IG spend this financial year.

IG appears to have matured since our initial 2017 survey, with almost two thirds assessing their IG programs as intermediate or advanced in maturity and more respondents considering their organisation having a proactive IG stance than a reactive one. Despite this overarching finding, the majority of respondents from corporate backgrounds felt their organisation was taking a reactive IG approach, which could be attributed to the changes in the business landscape from COVID-19.

It’s pleasing to see that more than half of respondents feel that their organisation has addressed leadership in IG and data, but there is still room for improvement here noting that it is a requirement for all Australian Federal Government agencies to have a CIGO. We have also seen a consistent increase in the percentage of respondents indicating their accountable IG person is a peer of the C-suite.

We would like to thank Government Agencies Information Network (GAIN) Australia, Records and Information Management Professionals Australasia (RIMPA), the Data Management Association (DAMA), Australian Litigation Support Managers (ALSM), and Institute for Information Management (IIM) for distributing this survey to their members to enable us to include a broad range of professionals. We are delighted to have a number of affiliated Australian and global information organisations and look forward to continuing to work in collaboration with our members and growing affiliated organisations to discuss and highlight best practice information governance.

I would particularly like to thank the Advisory Board for their support of our third IG survey and, in particular, thank Dr Peter Chapman for his detailed work in analysing the statistics and assisting in the preparation of this report.

We hope you find the information relevant and applicable to your organisation. If you have any feedback or would like to get in touch please email susan.bennett@infogovanz.com

Susan Bennett, Founder & Executive Director
May 2021
### Respondent Insights

#### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the World</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Organisational Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software/Services Vendor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-for-Profit</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Size of Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Organisation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–100</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101–500</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501–1,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001–5,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001–10,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001+</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Role in Information Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners (Direct)</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners (Indirect)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unspecified</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Areas of Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records Management</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Governance</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk/Compliance</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analytics</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity/IT Security</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDiscovery</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Information Governance Initiative (IGI) defines Information Governance as:

‘The activities and technologies that organisations employ to maximise the value of the information while minimising associated risks and costs.’

In your opinion would this definition be enhanced by including the concepts of people and culture?

**YES 81%  NO 19%**

Overall, most participants confirmed a high level of agreement (81%) to include concepts of people and culture in the definition, with many commenting on the intrinsic nature of people and culture to information governance and its systems. However, some disagreed, saying that it would make the definition too broad, others highlighted the need to include processes and ethics to this definition.

“There is more to IG than technology itself and organisations. People and culture are interwoven in this domain.”

“Information is only valuable if people can access it and leverage it and have the understanding and motivation to do so.”

“Activities and technologies do not exist in isolation. How they are used, why they are used, and if they are used at all will be determined by values and resources, which is to say culture and politics, which is to say culture.”

“People yes, culture no. Though culture is important in the journey, it does not aide the definition. Whereas people carry out the activities using technology to achieve the goals set in this definition.”

“Yes, too often the role of people and culture is overlooked in IG, when it is really at the heart of effectively implementing proper IG compliance and best practice.”

“People and culture contribute directly to risk: good culture with appropriately trained people reduce IG risk, and the opposite increases it.”

“Many areas of data directly affect or relate to individuals; retaining a human focus is critical. On a related note, most of these ‘systems’ involve a significant human component thus people and culture are critical factors.”

“Culture is the great silent concept that binds people to technological networks.”

“More focus is needed on non-technology aspects. Many jump straight to information management/technology instead of starting with information strategy & governance. This involves thinking about the meaning and value of Information.”

“Staff are essential to effective IG. Without people and culture, activities and tech would be meaningless.”

“Information governance needs to be kept as simple as possible to help ensure adherence. The introduction of people and culture into it would provide too many variables and make IG in a number of organisations either unworkable or difficult to understand.”
Do you view IG as an umbrella concept that describes all information management activities?

There was significant agreement across organisation type and size, with 76% of respondents agreeing with this statement. This was in alignment with 2017 (74%) and 2019 (75%) results.

---

Does your organisation govern IG with a formal IG framework with policies and procedures?

There was a substantial increase in agreement compared to 2019 and 2017 results (which were 51% and 55%). Government organisations were more likely to have implemented a formal IG framework than their corporate and NFP counterparts, with 71% of government respondents indicating they agreed with this statement compared to 53% in the corporate sector and 67% in not-for-profit organisations.

---

Does your organisation have IG projects underway or planned in the next year?

Majority of organisations have at least one IG project in motion, or planned across the next 12 months, in line with previous surveys. Not-for-profit organisations were the most likely to be working on or planning IG projects, with 86% answering yes, compared to 79% of government and 71% of corporates.

---

"Information has always existed at the intersections of people, process and technology; adding people and culture makes perfect sense. People’s beliefs impact on what information is created, stored, shared, accessed, and disposed of."
INFORMATION GOVERNANCE DRIVERS

If your organisation has IG projects underway or planned in the next year, to what extent have they been driven by changes in privacy laws, such as CCPA, GDPR, New Zealand Privacy Act 2020 and mandatory reporting of breaches?

Over half of respondents (52%) indicated that recent changes to privacy laws have had some impact on their current IG projects. However, there seems to be an overall reduction in privacy laws driving IG projects.

To what extent have they been driven by changes in privacy laws?

- Not at all driven: 7%
- Slightly driven: 14%
- Somewhat driven: 22%
- Largely driven: 41%
- Totally driven: 8%

In line with the 2019 results, corporate respondents were more likely to indicate the new regulatory environment is largely driving their IG projects when compared with government respondents (43% versus 17.5%). This may be due to a greater number of corporate respondents handing personal information of EU data subjects and dealing with cross-border transfers of personal data as a result of the GDPR, CCPA and/or New Zealand’s Privacy Act 2020.

There was also an increase in the percentage of very large organisations (10,000+) reporting privacy as a significant driver for IG projects. All other size categories reported a reduction in this area.
What IG activities and solutions are most important?

- Implementing or maintaining an IG framework
- Complying with privacy regulations
- Updating policies and procedures (including BYOD and remote working policies)
- Data loss prevention
- Big data analytics
- Legacy data consolidation
- Migrating unstructured information from one system to another
- Establishing a defensible deletion policy
- Decommissioning an archive or system
- Other

Participants recognised that a range of IG activities and solutions are relevant within their organisations, however, implementing or maintaining an IG framework remained the key IG activity following the results of the 2019 and 2017 surveys. Compliance with privacy regulations, updating of policies and procedures, data loss prevention rounded out the top four.

Given the increase in working from home over the last 12 months, it is surprising that there seems to be a slightly lower priority on updating policy and procedures (including BYOD). There was also a reduction in the focus on privacy compliance, in contrast to a slight increase in legacy data consolidation.

To what extent has COVID-19 impacted the IG activities of your organisation?

- Minor impact
- Major impact
- No impact at all

The survey results indicate COVID-19 impacts have not been as heavy in respect to IG activities and decision-making. However, it appears that some of the advice around COVID-19 is being ignored by organisations around data breaches and cybersecurity. The following page highlights an increase in external factors, including data breach driving IG projects.
What are the main driving factors for IG projects in your organisation?

The three main drivers for IG projects remain the same: external regulatory, compliance, or legal obligations; good business management practices; and internal technology restructuring or transition — although their importance is slightly diminished compared to previous surveys. These driving factors were echoed across all organisation sectors.

The only increase for IG drivers appears to be in external events, such as data breach, lawsuit, investigation. This seems to be most prominent in corporate respondents, with over 46% of these respondents indicating this category as a key driver. This may be reflecting the increase in ransomware and other cyber-criminal activity as reported by agencies/authorities and in the media.

One in five indicated that COVID-19 was a driving factor for IG projects. One of the known issues arising from COVID-19 was a substantial increase in malicious cyber-attacks on organisations.
How would you rate the maturity of your organisation’s overall IG program?

In a positive sign, IG programs in organisations continue to appear to be maturing with 57% indicating their programs were intermediate or advanced, compared to 54% in 2019 and 47% in 2017, which is encouraging.

Compared with the results of the 2019 survey, the relative confidence in the maturity of corporate and governmental IG has switched. This time around 62% of government respondents reported their organisation had either advanced or intermediate IG maturity against only 49% of corporate respondents saying the same.

Respondents from very small organisations reported substantially higher IG maturity than larger ones. This is possibly an effect of smaller organisations not having to deal with extensive legacy, complex infrastructure and control issues.
How do you view your organisation’s IG programs?

Responses indicated a roughly even split between proactive and reactive approaches to IG (46% versus 41%). While in 2019 participants appeared to have better clarity of their programs, in this year’s survey 13% of participants indicated they ‘don’t know’ which is comparable to the results in 2017.

In this year’s survey, the major change was from the corporate sector, appearing to be more reactive (56%) than proactive (37%) this year. Government organisations were stable and reported similarly aligned with previous results.

As for the previous 2019 survey, respondents indicating that the IG program at their organisation was in an advanced maturity state were more likely to also indicate their program as being proactive.
INFORMATION GOVERNANCE LEADERSHIP

Does your organisation have an established role for IG leadership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2021

On average 55% of respondents indicate their organisation has an established role for IG leadership.

This is largely uniform across all size organisations, excepting the respondents in the 5,000-10,000 bracket who have less than 40% with this role. This seems unusual given the need for a specific role should increase along with organisational size.

It’s pleasing to see that there has been an increase to more than half of respondents’ organisations having addressed leadership in IG and data but there is still a lot of room for improvement here, particularly as it is now a requirement for all Government agencies to have a CIGO.

Does your organisation have a multi-disciplinary IG steering committee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2021

Participants indicated a slightly lower numbers than with the previous question about an established role for IG leadership — around 42% of respondents indicate they have the multi-disciplinary IG steering committee.

Much like the IG leadership role, the likelihood of a committee would likely increase along with organisational size but the 5,000–10,000 cohort do not follow this pattern with only 35% reporting the existence of such a committee.

As expected, the presence of a committee is correlated with a proactive IG approach and vice versa for a reactive IG approach.

Is ‘information governance’ or ‘data governance’ in the job title of the individual with overall accountability for IG in your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2021

In this year’s survey, 33% of 2021 respondents indicated that one or both these terms are in the title as opposed to 20% who indicated one or both were in the title in 2019.

The highest proportion of the use of this title (nearly 50%) was in the cohort of respondents from organisation with between 500 and 1,000 employees.

Is the individual accountable for IG in your organisation a peer of the C-suite (senior executives)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2021

We have seen a consistent increase in the percentage of respondents indicating their accountable IG person is a peer of the C-suite — 47% in 2021 versus 41% in 2019 and 39% in 2017.

Around 64% of the respondents who believe their organisation has a proactive stance on IG also indicated that the individual accountable for IG in their organisation is a peer of the C-suite.

It is encouraging to see that the overall importance with which organisations are treating the individual responsible for IG is increasing from previous surveys.
**INFORMATION GOVERNANCE PROJECTS**

In the last 12 months, what is the average number of IG projects your organisation is working on?

The majority of organisations appear to be restricting the number of IG projects they were undertaking, with two-fifths of respondents indicating that only 1–3 projects were being conducted. In contrast, larger organisations appear to be increasing the number of projects they are undertaking.

A further 27% respondents didn’t know how many projects their organisation had undertaken, indicating a lack of clarity within some organisations about IG efforts, with an especially high representation from large organisations. It is possible that the complexity and communication channels of large organisations is driving this response to a degree.

**Does your organisation expect to increase IG spend this financial year?**

36% of organisations are expecting to increase their IG spend, showing an increasing trend from the 2017 and 2019 surveys.

In particular, corporate respondents indicated increased expenditure intention with 45% of respondents indicated such intentions compared with 33% in 2019.

**Where does your organisation purchase IG Services?**

The responses in this year’s survey show a continuing strengthening of intention to purchase from 2019 and 2017, particularly corporate respondents purchasing from software and hardware suppliers.
Do you feel you have appropriate training and knowledge to contribute effectively to IG activities in your organisation?

Most respondents (57%) feel they do have appropriate training and knowledge to contribute — although having a third indicate “no” is a concerning result.

There seems to be a loose trend in terms of respondents from larger organisations feeling less confident in their ability to contribute to IG in their organisation.

Some participants thoughts on training and knowledge:

“Constant need for upskilling, so I don’t feel I ever know all that is required.”

“IG is such a huge scope now, my skillset is only a fraction of the total picture.”

“With the rapid changes I am constantly seeking ongoing training opportunities.”

“This is a work in progress — ask again in six to 12 months and the answer may be different.”

“Yes, but there is always more to know.”

“Constantly changing technological and legal environments mean it’s vital to keep up with what is happening.”

Our final question asked whether there is any area of IG you would want to learn more about in 2021. Thank you for the responses and we will be directing our events and workshops to the areas of interest that were highlighted by the survey.
InfoGovANZ would like to thank our sponsors and affiliates for supporting the 2021 IG Industry Report.
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About InfoGovANZ

InfoGovANZ brings together professionals from different disciplines across all types of organisations to develop and promote information governance best practices and innovations. By building a network of multi-disciplinary professionals, information silos will be broken down, enabling connected thinking and innovation that leads to information governance best practices. This, in turn, will promote the delivery of better outcomes for organisations by both minimising risk and maximising the value of the information held within organisations. Visit our website for more information — [www.infogovanz.com](http://www.infogovanz.com)