Summary of Open Government studies conducted within the InterPARES Trust Project

By Jim Suderman
14 October 2017

1.   Introduction

This short essay pulls together a number of InterPARES Trust studies relating to open government. Examination of open government initiatives addresses central interests and purposes of the InterPARES Trust Project.

> InterPARES Trust (2013-2018) is a multi-national, interdisciplinary research project exploring issues concerning digital records and data entrusted to the Internet. Its goal is to generate theoretical and methodological frameworks to develop local, national and international policies, procedures, regulations, standards and legislation, in order to ensure public trust grounded on evidence of good governance, a strong digital economy, and a persistent digital memory.[1]

Studies were conducted within one seven teams, based on geography. These included the teams from Africa, Australasia, Europe (including Israel), Latin America, North America, and a Transnational Team.

Of the Project's 101 approved studies, nine were identified as pertaining directly or in part to open government. In effect, studies were categorized as 'open government studies' for the purposes of this essay if

- the name of the study included either "open government," "open data," or some variation, e.g., "Open Data and Open Government in Latin America (study LA05);
- the study examined definitions of open government, e.g., "A Research Report into Open Government Data in NHS England" (study EU19); or
- the study emphasized public access to records of government, e.g., ""Policy and Plurality: Final Report" (study NA17).

Of the approved studies, only those that produced a final report, all of which are characterized in the appendix, were considered in this overview. Other studies which focused on issues that might be relevant to government records including:

- "Protection of Privacy in the Cloud" (NA15)
- "Standard of practice for trust in protection of authoritative records in government archives" (NA03)
- "Security Classification of Records in International Organizations: An Annotated Bibliography" (TR03)

were reviewed but linking their findings to the concept of open government was considered to be too indirect to be reliable and so they are not reflected here.

The first five reports issued were all from the European team. "The Role of the Records Manager in an Open Government Environment in the UK" (EU03) was issued in late 2014, with the next four, which were all issued in the latter half of 2015:

- Open Government Data Literature Review (EU02)
- Role of the Archivist and Records Manager in an Open Government Environment in Sweden, The (EU11)
- A Case Example of Public Trust in Online Records: The UK care.data Programme (EU17)

---

[1] InterPARES Trust home page (https://interparestrust.org/trust), accessed 12 August 2017.

- The role of the records manager / records management in an open government environment in the UK: the National Health Service (EU19)

The two studies on the role of records managers in the UK and Sweden were expressly complementary.

Fig. 1: Timeline of open government reports

2014		
November	"The role of the records manager in an open government environment in the UK: Case Study 2014"	EU03
2015		
September	• "The role of the archivist and records manager in an open government environment in Sweden"	EU11
	• "A case example of public trust in online records – The UK care.data programme"	EU17
November	"A Research Report into Open Government Data in NHS England"	EU19
December	"Open Government Data Literature Review"	EU02
2016		
September	• "Trusted online access to distributed holdings of digital public records"	AA05
	• "The Implications of Open Government, Open Data, and Big Data on the Management of Digital Records in an Online Environment"	NA08
December	"Social Media and Trust in Government" (Phase 1 Final Report)"	NA05
2017		
May	"Policy and Plurality: Final Report"	NA17

Some of the studies including the "Open Government Data Literature Review" (EU02) and "The Implications of Open Government, Open Data, and Big Data on the Management of Digital Records in an Online Environment" (NA08) – the last issued an interim report in point form in February 2014 – were conducted with the specific intention of informing subsequent studies. However, it is not clear as to how much the early studies influenced later ones, or whether conclusions of later studies might supersede or modify conclusions of earlier studies.

Five of the reports under consideration do not make reference to any other open government study. Three of the four that do only name such studies, i.e., they do not discuss their findings, preliminary or otherwise. The most substantive statements are in Michelle Spelay's "Trusted online access to distributed holdings of digital public records" (AA05) which notes that James Lowry's "Open Government Data Literature Review" "provides extensive research in [making digital government records available to the public]." (p. 13) and Tove Engvall, Victor Liang, and Karen Anderson's "The role of the archivist and records manager in an open government environment in Sweden" (EU11) which opens by stating that it complements the similarly named study in the UK (EU03).

Likewise five of the studies did not produce a literature review either as a stand alone study or as part of the respective final reports. James Lowry's study comprises of a literature review and the Australasian study AA05 has only produced a literature review. Both NA05 and NA17 published annotated bibliographies, with NA05 including a literature review as well.

2.   Definitions

Of the studies identified above, four (EU03, EU11, EU19, NA08) directly address definitions in their final reports, although it needs to be mentioned that the "Open Government Data Literature Review" (EU02) commented where literature reviewed contained definitions. Neither 'open government' nor 'open government data' are found in the InterPARES Trust glossary or dictionary although a definition for e-government is provided in both.[2] It should also be noted that the report of the "Policy and Plurality" study thoroughly considered the definitions of plurality, for which there is clear overlap with concepts of open government.

Interviews conducted by the UK study on the role of the records manager (EU03) identified common elements for the definition of open government data, such as 'freely available,' 're-use,' and 'machine readable.' It also references the definition provided on the Council Council's website "'non-personal datasets we publish on our website available to everyone in a format that can be reused.'" (p. 7) The report suggests that a clear and comprehensive definition of open government data may appear once the Council's Open Data Policy is published. The study of open government data in NHS [National Health Service] England observes that defining open government data is difficult, observing a lack of consistency in definitions established to date. For this reason, a definition is provided within the report to clarify what it means in the context of the study. The definition emphasizes the quality of re-use "...released with the aim of achieving a number of, sometimes rather different, benefits" (p. 8) and the report identifies the terms 'transparency,' 'accountability,' and 'governance' as related terms.

The definitions of these terms are well-established in Sweden according to the study or the role of records managers in that jurisdiction. Definitions of open, open government, open data, and open government data as set out by the Open Government Partnership, Open Government Working Group, opendefinition.org, the European Parliament's PSI-[Public Sector Information] Directive and the European Commission's Inspire Directive have been adopted by national bodies, including the Swedish E-delegation, the Swedish Association of Local Authorities, and VINNOVA, an agency for government innovation. The apparent contrast of clarity of definition between the UK and Swedish studies may be a result of the former focusing on the local government level while the latter has a more national focus.

The report of the North American study, "The Implications of Open Government, Open Data, and Big Data on the Management of Digital Records in and Online Environment" also notes the challenge of defining the evolving term 'open government.' The study adopted the four principles of the Open Government Partnership "as the definitional scope for the term" in the study's third and final phase. (p. 8) Definitions of open government, open data, and big data are not found in the final report for the study's first two phases but are explored in publications by the members of the study:

- John McDonald and Valerie Léveillé, "Whither the retention schedule in the era of big data and open data?"[3]
- Valerie Léveillé and Katherine Timms, "Through a Records Management Lens: Creating a Framework for Trust in Open Government and Open Government Information"[4]

The definitional variation of open government, open [government] data, and big data illustrates one of

---

[2] As of 4 September 2017.

[3] John McDonald, Valerie Léveillé, (2014),"Whither the retention schedule in the era of big data and open data?", *Records Management Journal*, Vol. 24 Iss 2 pp. 99 – 121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/RMJ-01-2014-0010.

[4] Valerie Léveillé, Katherine Timms, (2015), "Through a Records Management Lens: Creating a Framework for Trust in Open Government and Open Government Information," *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 154-199.

the challenges of establishing common record keeping policies or approaches to supporting open initiatives.

The absence of widely adopted definitions of these terms, within individual countries and internationally, presents a second challenge to the establishment of common record keeping policies, namely limiting the confidence in the quality and reliability of records created in support of open government initiatives. While the documentation for any given initiative may be extensive, it may be difficult to establish that it reflects the actual decision-making or final outcomes. This is certainly one of the driving considerations behind the article by Léveillé and Timms[5] but a limitation of that article is that the completeness and reliability of the records of open government initiatives are established purely in the context of a specific initiative as opposed to any initiative. This differs from assessing the completeness and reliability of accounting records, for example, which follow internationally adopted accounting principles and practices.

3.   Policies and procedures

Some studies addressed existing policies and procedures within the jurisdiction of the study, either specifically by name, e.g., the "Records Management Policy" for County Councils,[6] or just noted their existence, e.g., the Records Policy elements in the final report of Social Media and Trust in Government.[7] Of note is a guide produced within the InterPARES Trust project itself, "Managing Records of Citizen Engagement Initiatives: A Primer" the objectives of which are:

- To enhance awareness of the relationship between recordkeeping and [Government-Citizen Engagement] initiatives;
- To suggest approaches for addressing recordkeeping issues that impact trust relationships between governments and their citizens.[8]

"The Role of the Records Manager in an Open Government Environment in the UK" report discusses a number of policies, procedures, or codes relevant to record keeping. Of the documents discussed in the report, the following are published by the national government:

- Lord Chancellor's code of practice on the management of records issued under section 46 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (2009);
- Local Government Transparency Code (2014).

The following are issued by the local, i.e., County, government:

- Data Protection Policy (2012);
- Freedom of Information Policy (2012);
- Information Management Manual (2013);
- Records Management Policy (2012);

---

[5] Valerie Léveillé, Katherine Timms, 2015.

[6] Jessica Page, Andrew Flinn, Elizabeth Shepherd, "The Role of the Records Manager in an Open Government Environment in the UK," (EU03, 2014) p. 15.

[7] Pat Franks, et al, "Social Media and Trust in Government, Phase I Final Report" (2016), see especially, pp. 54-5 and 72-3.

[8] Grant Hurley, Valerie Léveillé, John McDonald. "Managing Records of Citizen Engagement Initiatives: A Primer," 2016. (Available online at https://interparestrust.org/assets/public/dissemination/NA08_20161001_ManagingRecordsCitizenEngagement_Primer_Final.pdf, checked 10 September 2017.)

- Action plan for records management policy (2014), a workbook based on the records management code of practice issued by the National Archives, cited above.

One of the research questions of the complementary study in Sweden (EU11) looked at what guidelines and strategies were needed and noted gaps, including some of the reasons those gaps existed, more than what guidance was already in place.[9] In particular, the study noted a gap between the high-level or long-term goals of open government and the specific steps to be taken, i.e., a vision of the target state exists but there is no road map in place to get there. The study also noted gaps relating to appraisal such as the need to embed open access to data from its creation and the need that the information not be compromised upon acquisition by the institution. Another gap related to risks relating to the different roles involved in creating and providing open data. The need to disassociate the municipal Archives from "how information is used once it is made available" is intriguing. The conclusion that more data needs to be classified, arranged, and described (p. 19) so that confidential information can be better protected.

The report of the Open Government Data Literature Review (EU02) by James Lowry lists numerous guides, including one specifically on records management published by the Open Government Guide in 2015 (p. 22), which primarily focuses on "controls to ensure the trustworthiness of data" (p 73). It also registers a number produced relatively recently by the Open Data Institute but Lowry notes that the content of these "suggests an absence of records / archives technical knowledge" (p. 75). Lowry highlights in his annotation of a 2014 paper by Anneke Zuiderwijk and Marijn Janssen entitled "Open Data Policies, Their Implementation and Impact: A Framework for Comparison" the observation that

> there is a multiplicity of open data policies at various levels of government, whereas very little systematic and structured research has been done on the issues that are covered by open data policies, their intent and actual impact. (pp. 70-71)

The report notes growing attention, although not necessarily by records professionals, to

- privacy and data anonymisation (p. 76);
- maturity models or ways to evaluate open data and open data practices (pp. 78-79).

The report on the UK National Health Service (EU19) considers the "NHS Records Management Code" in some depth, observing that in its current state it "has little to offer the Open Government Data agenda" (p. 43). It also explores the Information Governance Toolkit, "a prerequisite of N3 connectivity,"[10] and used by NHS organizations to self-assess practices. It is likely for this reason that the [UK] National Archives seeks to integrate record keeping guidance into this toolkit. However, the report questions whether the toolkit is being implemented honestly, with one interviewee noting that "'organisations have found it relatively easy to "game" toolkit completion and thus record high toolkit scores which did not reflect the reality of IG practice within that organisation'" (p. 45) The report lauds the approach by NHS England through "...embedding of the openness agenda across all work streams, 'a case of building in rather than creating something separate and different.'" (p. 47) but acknowledges the challenges interviewees identified to this approach. Other challenges to the development of policy and guidance identified include

---

[9] Stockholm's "Digital Archival Strategy" is prominent in the report but primarily in terms of placing the municipal Archives program as a key player in the open government space and aligning the value of the Archives program with the values of open government.

[10] The report describes N3 "an intranet for the NHS, is a 'necessity' in everyday business, providing, amongst other services, 'secure email' (Interview two). Put simply, 'you cannot do business with or as the NHS if you are not N3 compliant'" (p. 45).

- the approach that open government data is a by-product of service delivery rather than a central service in and of itself, in other words, the work ends with the publication of datasets;
- a fear of the media or perhaps more precisely, a fear of loss of trust or confidence among elected officials and public sector organizations alike brought about by media reports that mis-represent (not necessarily deliberately) what government intends to do with personal information.

A key observation of the [(NA08)] report is that policies and guidelines on what constitutes open government processes is itself limited. In other words, in the absence of comprehensive open government policy or practice suites from which to clarify what records should be created, what purpose(s) they need to fulfill, and how they should be managed and accessed over time. (p. 11) The investigation into citizen engagement initiatives (referred to as 'Open Dialogue' in the Canadian Open Government context) illustrated that no comprehensive policies on citizen engagement existed at any level of government, and even more so than open data initiatives, record keeping guidance on citizen engagement initiatives are effectively absent in Canada. The report also observes that one of the key benefits conventionally attributed to records management, namely the limitation of liability by the disposal of information at the end of an authorized retention period, may be reduced by open government objectives of providing access to data and information indefinitely.

Reinforcing the link between policies and practice for open government initiatives generally, the UK care.data programme report (EU17) provides an excellent illustration of the guidance needed for producers and consumers of government data, whether it will be open or closed. It also establishes that issues of trust in government has as much to do with clarity of intent and effectiveness of communication as any specific policies or practices for managing records and information. Some of this perspective is also found in the more general report on the UK National Health Service. The need for more classification, arrangement, and description of government data expressed in the Swedish study on the role of the archivists and records manager suggests that limited knowledge of the universe of data among record keepers in a particular jurisdiction may itself be a serious constraint on the development of policies and strategies. It is clear from the reports that, generally speaking, record keeping considerations and records keepers have had limited integration with open government initiatives in the jurisdictions reviewed. It appears that is changing but challenges to moving forward remain, such as the lack of clarity and consistency of short- and long-term open government objectives and the recognition of record keeping considerations as substantively contributing to those objectives.

4.   Role of Records Managers and Archivists

The report of the Policy and Plurality study (NA17) highlights the aspiration of the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation (NCTR) to give priority of access to its holdings to Indian Residential School survivors, their families, and communities. The study examines how policy is used at the NCTR to facilitate "plural conceptions of trust," (p. 4) specifically in an online environment. The ways that the goals affect the role of records keepers are clearly set out and range from ownership of the NCTR's records to preserving cultural memory in such a way that "helps affected communities and broader society understand, heal, and move forward towards a society in which plural cultural understandings can co-exist." (p. 8)

At least on the surface, these roles appear to differ significantly from that identified in other studies, including the studies on the role of records keepers in the U.K. (EU03) and Sweden (EU11). In the U.K. study, the Records Manager is a member of a County's Information Resilience and Transparency Team,

along with an Information Access Officer and an Information Governance Specialist. Within that team, the Records Manager "ensures recordkeeping systems are compliant with relevant legislation and manages the retention schedules and information asset register." (p. 6) In Sweden, where records management and those undertaking such work have a low profile, their role includes creating documentation frameworks, i.e., what must be documented, providing access to information, and promote transparency and openness. (p. 12) As in the U.K., records keepers in Sweden must collaborate with other professionals, including technology specialists, lawyers, and administrators. (p. 17) The Implications of Open Government study (NA08), as with the two European studies, likewise noted an evolving role for records keepers, ranging from adapting retentions schedules to closer engagement by records keepers in open government initiatives, such as citizen engagement.

Clearly emerging from all these reports is the need for records keepers to collaborate with other professionals and subject matter experts combined with the challenges of doing so. The Swedish study explores this evolving role more thoroughly than the others, referencing paradigms identified by Terry Cook, Sigrid McCausland, Jeannette Bastian, Angelika Menne-Haritz, and Heather MacNeil. Perhaps the role that emerges most clearly and consistently across the open government studies is that of the records keeper as mediator between the records and their users and between leaders of open government initiatives and the public. It is probably fair to say that the former role is a long-standing one. The latter role, which the Policy and Plurality study brings into high relief, suggests that records keepers actively participate in the trust- and relationship-building initiatives of open government, i.e., it gives them an immediate and participatory role that may be at odds with a more traditional role as a disinterested preserver. Without such participation, which appears to be the exception rather than the rule, the records themselves, however they are maintained or accessed, may not contribute substantively to establishing or enhancing trust.

5.   Concluding observations

It is clear from all the studies that the role of archivists and records manager in any open government context is a collaborative one. While it is true that archivists and records managers do not normally work in isolation when dealing with active records, they typically are at some distance from the governance of the work, i.e., focused on the by-product of organizational activities. These InterPARES Trust studies place archivists and records managers in a position much closer to planning and execution of open government initiatives, i.e., actively involved in determining the form and scope of the records produced so that they will sustain or build on the trust the open government initiatives are intended to foster. For example, open government requires managed records to not only be identified and maintained, but also to produce open data or to be mined for citizen sentiment. It may also be worth asking when records contribute to sustaining and building trust. One of the observations of the Social Media and Trust in Government study is that use of social media "increased both citizen awareness" which might suggest that some records contribute value early in the records lifecycle but this value may not increase or may erode over time.

What is less clear from the studies is the identification of who archivists and records managers should collaborate, with perhaps one exception. A number of the studies noted a low regard for or simply a lack of knowledge of the function of record keeping in the organizational contexts studied. One possible conclusion from such observations is that the trust open government is intended to foster is earned, sustained, or lost well before the quality and accessibility of the records enters the equation. This is most clearly illustrated by the study of the United Kingdom care.data Programme which describes the leaflets distributed in the context of a public information campaign as "a PR disaster." (p. 33) However,

where the context is not already compromised by poor communications – and the leaflet was not the only communication component that was poorly handled in the care.data programme – there is no suggestion that good records and record keeping could counteract actions that might compromise trust after the fact.

Since most of the studies observed a lack of understanding of the principles and purpose of record keeping, it may be that, at least in the early days and years of open government, archivists and records managers need to collaborate with those who can communicate the value of record keeping to those leading open government initiatives. This is clearly the premise of the Primer produced by the Implications of Open Government study (NA08) and clearly illustrated by the communications of the "Dig In" initiative campaign of the Stockholm Municipal Archives, referenced in the Role of the Archivist and Records Manager in in Sweden study (EU11).

The observations found in the Policy and Plurality study (NA17) suggest another perspective on collaboration, namely that it is unclear how, or even whether, good record keeping and good records can deliver on trust-building objectives. In this study the records are central to "healing" – one of several organizational objectives – and records keepers are central to the organizational governance, including the setting of priorities and policies, and have chosen to prioritize collaborating with the individuals and communities that are the subject of the records held. But, as suggested above, there may still be an educational element as to how records can actually achieve the trust-building or healing objectives that have been set even among the prioritized community.

The wide variation in definitions of open government and the absence of comprehensive open government policies form a fundamental challenge for records keepers. Who to collaborate with, what record keeping policies and governance should be developed, and how they can best be executed are dependent on what open government actually means in any given context. It may be that existing governance, policy and practice may be sufficient for government initiatives with the simple purpose informing citizens. These studies make it clear, however, that the *status quo* is inadequate for open government initiatives with more ambitious objectives.

Appendix 1
Characterizations of open government studies[11]
Listed in order of completion

Final Report: "The role of the records manager in an open government environment in the UK: Case Study 2014"
Authors: Jessica Page, Andrew Flinn, Elizabeth Shepherd.
Study code: EU03
Team: European
Date: 5 November 2014

- This study investigates the recordkeeping requirements for the effective and trusted proactive release of public sector information within a UK context.
- Case study looks at the function of a records manager in 2014 and what it ought to be in future.
- An Information Resilience and Transparency Team, including an Information Access Officer, Records Manager, and Information Governance Specialist, facilitates the County Council's compliance with information governance legislation.
- A related role, that of Business Intelligence Officer, is responsible for developing specialist knowledge and expertise relating to the national and local open data and data exploitation policy.
- In spite of an absence of a clear, comprehensive definition of open government data those interviewed had a common understanding of what it meant.
- Assumptions on which the "Transparency Code" standard was based did not recognize the reality of a predominantly paper-based record keeping system.
- The Code also revealed a tension between central government's desire to publish as much data as possible and local government's priority on publishing data the public will use.
- Existing guidance is incomplete in re the challenges, expertise and skills required to manage an open government data environment, e.g., available Records Management guides and responsibilities did not currently extend to datasets.
- Responsibility for open government data was decentralized across at least three organizational units.
- Priorities for guidance differed based on roles, e.g., the Information Access Officer looked for guidance in terms of clear definition of datasets and examples to use as precedents, while the Business Intelligence Officer looked for advice on publishing and linking data.
- While records management guidelines emphasized accuracy and reliability, effective re-use required that data to be published be monitored.
- An Information Management Manual, which emphasizes accuracy, authenticity, reliability and utility and the dependency on accurate records, does not specify how to achieve these objectives.
- The need to audit staff knowledge of policies and guidance was noted.
- Calls for additional advice may impact on the role of information governance specialists or records managers.
- Information Access Officer not involved in open government data policy development, as she is "more junior."

---

[11] Except where noted, all characterizations integrate comments received from the study author(s).

- FOI requests may have some use indicating data of interest, i.e., worth publishing as open government data.

Final Report: "The role of the archivist and records manager in an open government environment in Sweden"
Authors: Tove Engvall, Victor Liang, Karen Anderson
Study code: EU11
Team: Europe
Date: September 2015
- Central role of archival and records management profession in access to public records noted.
- Growing public expectations for new ways of accessing information such as Open Data.
- In Sweden archivists support records at all stages of the lifecycle, i.e., there is no distinct 'records manager' profession.
- Archivists see open data as promoting the value of information and improving access to it.
- Risk of confidential information being revealed – a concern of Info Security.
- Low priority of archivists' role and records management work noted.
- Information and communication technologies tend to dominate at the expense of policy, procedure, and participation.
- Need identified for archivists to be more proactive, to claim a more strategic role in organizations.
- Government cannot think that open data is the only solution to address transparency issues and make for more informed citizens, especially if there is an overload of poorly documented data.
  - Democracy and public interest should drive open data.
- Open data not changing fundamental statutory environment.
- Role of archivists:
  - Involvement to maintain authenticity, trustworthiness and accuracy of data throughout the process of producing open data (properly contextualizing information and data).
  - Will need to understand metadata – establish a metadata standard.
  - Identifies competencies needed for the future by the profession.
- Guidance needed:
  - Strategies and guidelines for effectively managing glut of systems.
  - Municipal archives need to insulation from how open data is used.
  - Establish a solid and enduring definition of open.
  - Better security classification, arrangement and description, knowing data better.
  - Identification of data user groups, and what info will be relevant.
  - Practical guidance on open data work understood by users and other professionals
- Complements "The role of the records manager in an open government environment in the UK" (EU03)

Final Report: "A case example of public trust in online records – The UK care.data programme"
Authors: Sue Childs, Julie McLeod
Study code: EU17
Team: European
Date: 21 September 2015
- This study examines the governance of the care.data programme in the United Kingdom from the inception of the programme in 2012 through 2015. It
  - Conducted a 360° view of care.data programme stakeholders;

- o Developed a reproducible methodological approach based on analysis of public discourse;
  - o Identified issues to be addressed in policy, procedure and/or practice for managing digital records in programmes like care.data.
- The care.data programme collects and link data from all health and social care settings for the purpose of planning and monitoring services.
- Care.data sets (Health Episode Statistics or HES data) have been collected for years and pseudo-anonymised using a custom patient ID.
- Care.data integrates additional data sets from general practice (GP data), linking them to hospital data.
- GP data is far more individually identifiable than HES data and effectively includes the whole population, as opposed to HES data which covers only a small proportion of the population and is episodic.
- In the UK, patient records are public records and GPs are patient record data controllers, as defined under UK Data Protection Act.
- By the time of its scheduled implementation in 2014, resistance to the care.data programme among health professionals and privacy groups was strong and reported in mainstream media.
- The report establishes a timeline of key events though analysis of data collected by sampling of publicly available resources. A discourse (interpretive policy) analysis was conducted on a smaller sample of resources.
- Six themes were identified: i) Governance; ii) Purpose; iii) Consultation and Communication; iv) Informed Consent; v) Data Security; vi) Trust, with 26 sub-themes under these six.
- The main conclusions the study reached are that a crisis of trust can result from poor governance and conduct of a new programme using public digital records, rather than from confidence or trust in the records themselves, and that context is crucial (in this case the records related to individuals and contained personal information and there was wider socio-political distrust at the time).
- The study identified the following key factors for establishing trust in a digital records programme:
  - o Meaningful consultation and good communication with all stakeholders;
  - o Agreement between all stakeholders about the purpose of the programme: what data is required, for what uses, and who can access it;
  - o Agreement between all stakeholders about the procedures and governance arrangements;
  - o A strong, well communicated, informed consent procedure;
  - o Good data security procedures, protecting personal, sensitive, and identifiable data.

Final Report: "A Research Report into Open Government Data in NHS England"
Authors: Emma Harrison, Elizabeth Shepherd, Andrew Flinn
Study code: EU19
Team: European
Date: 9 November 2015
- The study examined "the requirements for operating effective and trusted proactive release of information for re-use within England's health sector" in terms of policy, advice, and the role of the records manager, observing that there "does not currently seem to be a natural synergy between Records Management and Open Government Data in the NHS" (2)

- A definition of Open Government Data is proposed – "*the release of information by public sector bodies for re-use, released with the aim of achieving a number of, sometimes rather different, benefits*." - and discussed in relation to
  - o the various ways that Open Government is conceptualized;
  - o the meanings of transparency, accountability, and governance.
- The report observes that effective recordkeeping cannot ensure Open Government Data.
- Governance, specifically information governance in the health sector, is addressed in terms of security related requirements and the consolidation of specialist knowledge.
- The study gathered information through a literature review and four qualitative interviews.
- Policies / documents considered in some depth included the
  - o NHS Records Management Code (41)
  - o Information Governance toolkit (44)
- Interviewees viewed the RM Code and records managers as separate, rather than integral to, Open Government Data, in part because records management has a negative perception in the NHS (44).
- Interviewees observed that while the Information Governance Toolkit could be 'an engine for change'" organisations could easily 'game' it to get high scores without concomitant changes to the practice of information governance. (45)
- Identified challenges to embedding the openness agenda at NHS England include:
  - o Uncertainty about the concept of Open Government Data;
  - o Confusion of OGD with publication of personal health information;
  - o A widespread expectation that simply publishing datasets will generate benefits of OGD;
  - o Fear of the media (49).
- Inconsistencies identified in the practice of preparing OGD included:
  - o "a spectrum of metadata processes, rather than one 'standardised' process." (52)
  - o Without the application of "basic Records Management principles...at the point of data creation [the level of management required to publish data] would be less problematic."
    - ▪ Management included anonymisation/removal of PI, linking published OGD to the original data source,
- Report notes that there is no "average user" in mind when publishing data, i.e., released data is aimed at a technical audience including developers, analysts, charity activists, health-watch members, and 'super-engaged patients'. (56)
- Concluding observations are that
  - o OGD and records management, which "have previously been running as separate pathways" (61), are now asking similar questions re digital longevity, continued accessibility, data integrity, and metadata.
  - o A more mature policy environment "would help to fulfil some of the anticipated benefits of Open Government Data." (62)
  - o The apparent "lack of interest [in OGD] from the general public" needs to be explored while observing that monitoring use is not what OGD is about.

Final Report: "Open Government Data Literature Review"
Authors: James Lowry
Study code: EU02
Team: European
Date: 10 December 2015

- Review noted that the relationships between open government data, public records, freedom of information, linked data and the role of recordkeepers and of data scientists is not fully understood;
- The review identifies 174 items from 136 authors or sources (note that only primary authors were counted), of which 83 are annotated, predominantly dating from 2012-2015.
- The review noted that
    o while resources on Open Government are growing rapidly much of the discourse is spread across various media and platforms and between a range of actors;
    o the intersection between open government data and records and archives management is under-researched.
- The review found that open government data is an area of convergence between disparate disciplines, each with its own vocabulary. Terms such as 'quality', 'value', and 'persistence' are used differently by different communities. For instance, provenance has a particular meaning in archival science, but it is also used in data management.
- Studies looking at the correlations of access to information, open data, and political streams provide a means of extending enquiry into the connections between the fields of open data and records and archives, e.g., in relation to privacy.
- Scholarly writing has introduced broader issues in the literature, e.g., bringing government legacy data into the public domain, visualisation of open government data,
- The review notes that civic technologies, e.g., GotToVote, Fix my Street, which enable engage and empower private individuals in political processes, have not been examined by the records and archives community.
- The review
    o observes that while national studies of open government data exist, international, comparative studies are rare;
    o identifies a number of areas for further research, emphasizing that such research will necessarily require collaboration with experts outside of the records and archives field.

Paper: "Trusted online access to distributed holdings of digital public records" [Lit review]
Author: Michelle Spelay
Study Code: AA05
Team: Australasia
Date: September 2016

- The review focuses on government responsibilities and obligations to:
    o provide public access to government records (not in the custody of an archival institution) in all formats;
    o make the public aware that government information is available and educate the public on how to access it;
- The review notes that current approaches to providing public access to government records are inadequate due to policy gaps and technological constraints.
    o Some literature identifies ways to improve public access, including through the use of social media.
- The review observes that risks of providing public access to government records, including privacy protection and embarrassment of elected officials, is thoroughly addressed in the literature.

- The literature emphasizes a collaborative role for information management professionals to work with other professionals, particularly in information technology, to make government information accessible while managing the risks of doing so.
  - o The review notes the inclusion of greater public access in a number of national open government action plans.

Final Report: "The Implications of Open Government, Open Data, and Big Data on the Management of Digital Records in an Online Environment"
Author [Writers]: Jim Suderman, Kat Timms
Study Code: NA08
Team: North American
Date: September 2016

- The study comprised three phases:
  i. the evolving definitions of the three terms was outlined, and addressed Open Government and Open Data were considered at as business processes;
  ii. included an overview of Open Government initiatives at all three levels of government in Canada and identified six categories of 'information objects' resulting from Open Government initiatives;
  iii. focused on recordkeeping concerns relating to citizen engagement initiatives, a subset of Open Government activities.
- The five essential contexts identified by earlier InterPARES research and the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Public Participation Spectrum provided the analytical lenses for the review of citizen engagement initiatives.
- The study concluded that:
  - o recordkeeping policy and practice were weak or absent in relation to aspects of Open Government, particularly citizen engagement initiatives;
    - ▪ "Managing Records of Citizen Engagement Initiatives: A Primer" was prepared by team members Grant Hurley, Valerie Léveillé, and John McDonald to begin to address this finding.
  - o records of citizen engagement initiatives were fragmented by participating organizations and by the range of technology platforms used;
  - o few indicators or measures of success for Open Government initiatives have been established, in part due to widely varying governance, unspecified accountability, and an incomplete policy framework or the presence of countervailing polices.

Final Report: "Social Media and Trust in Government" (Phase 1 Final Report)
Author: Pat Franks (Lead Researcher), et al.
Study code: NA05
Team: North American
Date: 9 December 2016

- This report explores social media initiatives of twenty cities in the US and Canada to understand how social media has been used to engage citizens, deliver services, and the reaction of public.
- The study's research questions are:
  - o Can social media be used by government to increase citizen trust?

- o Is there a statistically significant relationship between trust in government and social media initiatives? If so, what are common elements to improve social media strategies and increase social capital?
- The literature review element of the study explored definitions and types of trust, relying on trust measures published by Pew Research for the People and the Press (U.S.) and the Edelman Trust Barometer (Canada).
- The study also analyzed sentiments expressed on three Twitter accounts (city, mayor, police) of the selected cities.
  - o The analysis of Twitter content included a lexicon-based technique, a machine learning-based technique, and SentiStrength, a non-binary tool.
- Additional information was collected through qualitative interviews and from the cities' websites.
- A profile of each of the twenty cities was prepared including a description of the city and statistics reflecting the demographics of the population that comprises the city, including race, median income, and level of education.
- The study found that the adoption of social media by local governments has increased rapidly, estimated at 67.5% in 2011 and 92% in 2013.
- The study found that the social media profiles of the twenty cities were relatively consistent, generally with "their largest audiences on Twitter, followed by Facebook." (34)
- The report compares the U.S. cities against the Canadian ones, e.g.,
  - o "Social media appeared to be used more to broadcast information than to provide services or elicit feedback [in the US]." (48) "Canadian cities appeared more interested than the US cities in building a brand and reputation online." (67)
  - o "Four of five [US] respondents noted increased citizen awareness, two reported message amplification, and two noted they learned about issues or emergencies." (50) "Most of the Canadian participants noted that using social media had increased both citizen awareness and their own responsiveness." (68)
  - o "While the [US] cities' social media posts were clearly subject to state public records laws, and all seven cities [responding to this question] in some way indicated that social media qualified as records, there were very few procedures in place for managing social media as records." (55) "Like the US respondents, a number of Canadian participants said they did not need to manage social media as records as the public could access the social media channels themselves, and two noted that only some of the posts were records." (74)
- The report concludes by observing that while "significant care was taken to implement controls around account creation, access, and content," it was generally acknowledged that "little effort was made to manage social media content [as records]." (76)[12]

Paper: "Policy and Plurality: Final Report"
Author: [Research Team: Lisa P. Nathan, Richard Arias-Hernandez, Samuel Mickelson]
Study Code: NA17
Team: North American
Date: May 2017
- The report addresses the following research questions:

---

[12] Pat Franks advises that she believes since the interviews were completed greater efforts are now being made to manage social media content as records. (Email to the author, 7 August 2017.)

- - What role is policy playing in negotiating plural conceptions of trust in multicultural contexts of digital archives of traumatic collections?
    - What are the challenges and opportunities for the policy design process and the infrastructure around it to mediate plurality and facilitate trust assertions by diverse stakeholders?
    - How do existing socio-technical arrangements and designs support or conflict with policies that aim at advancing pluralism in these collections?
    - How is the socio-technical infrastructure of the NCTR developing (with a particular focus on policy) in a national climate of high expectations and conflict?
- Appendix A of the report presents six different definitions of "pluralism."
- The study collected data through
    - A narrative literature review, included in the Final Report, establishing the context of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation (NCTR);
    - The capture of NCTR web pages containing policy developments and announcements from 2013 until the NCTR opened in November 2015;
    - Semi-structured interviews "with professionals associated with the development and/or management of the NCTR... to elicit the participants' opinions on the development of the NCTR's collection, particularly in relation to the policy development process." (8)
- The report notes a central conflict between the NCTR's determination "to privilege access for Indian Residential School survivors, their families and communities" (8) and access to the records by the general public
- The records held by the NCTR are collected "from seven different databases using six different metadata schemas," none of which enable users to add their own commentary.
    - The NCTR adopted a two-phased metadata policy, first to normalize the data "based on church and LAC standards (e.g., EAD), and then to incorporate "user-generated metadata." (8)
- The study observed the "impossibility" for a federated organization such as the NCTR to establish trust because of the "hundreds of First Nations, Metis and Inuit across Canada with distinct cultures, histories, and viewpoints" represented by the data. (9)
- The report emphasizes the importance of acknowledging "the harms perpetuated through historically dominant archival theories and practices" while questioning how those theories and practices can be shifted moving forward. (10)