

Defining Information Governance: Theory or Action?

Results of the 2011 ViaLumina and eDiscovery Journal
Information Governance Survey

Barclay T. Blair and Barry Murphy



Defining Information Governance: Theory or Action?

2011 Information Governance Survey Report

Report Overview

In a relatively short period, the phrase, “Information Governance” has evolved from an obscure specialist term to a branded concept that some global software and hardware companies are spending millions of dollars to popularize. In 2004, there were just over 400 instances of the phrase in Google’s US index; today there are hundreds of thousands.ⁱ Publications such as *The Economist* have covered the concept in detail and information management associations have begun to use the term to describe their member’s activities. Some organizations have created Information Governance departments and staffed them with a mix of lawyers, IT professionals, records managers, and business managers.

But, despite this rapid evolution, there is still no universally understood definition of Information Governance (IG). Beyond definitions, there is a more fundamental lack of consensus about whether the concept of IG has validity, or even it is even needed. Some grouse that IG is simply a rebranding of existing disciplines like records management, business intelligence, or master data management that is only designed to sell more product and services. Others argue that perhaps a little rebranding is not a bad thing, given the internal funding challenges that information management initiatives often face.

Whatever the case, it seems clear that the concept of IG has entered the consciousness of global corporations – an entry that does not seem likely to reverse

itself for some time. Consequently, we need to investigate what we mean when we talk about IG. That is the purpose of this survey report.

This survey report is based on an industry survey conducted by ViaLumina and eDiscovery Journal in Q3, 2011. A wide variety of industry professionals from a cross-section of vertical industries responded to the survey, providing a solid view into current IG ideas and plans.¹

¹ This work should be cited as: Blair, Barclay and Murphy, Barry, "Defining Information Governance: Theory or Action? Results of the 2011 Information Governance Survey," September 2011. ViaLumina, eDiscovery Journal.

©2011 ViaLumina, Ltd. and/or eDiscovery Journal ("the authors"). All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced or distributed without the author's prior permission. The information contained in this publication has been obtained from sources the authors believe to be reliable. The authors disclaim all warranties as to the completeness, adequacy, or accuracy of such information and shall have no liability for errors, omissions or inadequacies herein. The opinions expressed herein are subject to change without notice. Although the authors may include a discussion of legal issues, the authors do not provide legal advice or services and their research should not be used or construed as such. Cover photo: Haydn Blackey.

Table of Contents

Report Overview	1
Key Findings	4
Defining Information Governance	4
Corporate Governance	4
Defensible Deletion and Auto Classification.....	4
Advancing a Definition.....	6
Is IG Actionable?.....	8
IG Is a Big Umbrella.....	10
Documents vs. Data: Building a Bridge	12
Risk and Value: Two Sides of the Same Coin	14
eDiscovery: The Call To IG Action	15
Reporting Relationships and Department Responsibility	17
Executive Ownership of IG: A Leadership Vacuum?.....	19
Defensible Deletion: Expected Benefit of IG	23
Auto Classification: The Future, But When?	25
Conclusion.....	27