



Public Records Audit Report for University of Auckland Waipapa Taumata Rau

Prepared for Te Rua Mahara o te Kāwanatanga Archives
New Zealand

September 2023



Disclaimers

Inherent Limitations

This report has been prepared in accordance with our Consultancy Services Order with Te Rua Mahara o te Kāwanatanga Archives New Zealand (Te Rua Mahara) dated 26 November 2020. Unless stated otherwise in the CSO, this report is not to be shared with third parties. However, we are aware that you may wish to disclose to central agencies and/or relevant Ministers' offices elements of any report we provide to you under the terms of this engagement. In this event, we will not require central agencies or relevant Ministers' offices to sign any separate waivers.

The services provided under our CSO ('Services') have not been undertaken in accordance with any auditing, review or assurance standards. The term "Audit/Review" used in this report does not relate to an Audit/Review as defined under professional assurance standards.

The information presented in this report is based on that made available to us in the course of our work, publicly available information, and information provided by Te Rua Mahara and the University of Auckland Waipapa Taumata Rau. We have indicated within this report the sources of the information provided. Unless otherwise stated in this report, we have relied upon the truth, accuracy and completeness of any information provided or made available to us in connection with the Services without independently verifying it.

No warranty of completeness, accuracy or reliability is given in relation to the statements and representations made by, and the information and documentation provided by, University of Auckland Waipapa Taumata Rau management and personnel consulted as part of the process.

Third Party Reliance

This report is solely for the purpose set out in Section 2 and 3 of this report and for Te Rua Mahara and University of Auckland Waipapa Taumata Rau information, and is not to be used for any other purpose or copied, distributed or quoted whether in whole or in part to any other party without KPMG's prior written consent. Other than our responsibility to Te Rua Mahara, neither KPMG nor any member or employee of KPMG assumes any responsibility, or liability of any kind, to any third party in connection with the provision of this report. Accordingly, any third party choosing to rely on this report does so at their own risk. Additionally, we reserve the right but not the obligation to update our report or to revise the information contained therein because of events and transactions occurring subsequent to the date of this report.

Independence

We are independent of Te Rua Mahara in accordance with the independence requirements of the Public Records Act (PRA) 2005.

Contents

1. Executive summary	1
2. Introduction	3
3. This audit	3
4. Maturity Assessment	4
5. Audit findings by category and topic	5
Governance	5
Self-monitoring	9
Capability	10
Creation	11
Management	12
Storage	15
Access	16
Disposal	17
6. Summary of feedback	20
7. Appendix 1	21



1. Executive summary

Established in 1883, the University of Auckland Waipapa Taumata Rau (the University) is the largest public university in New Zealand, hosting over 40,000 students across five campuses.

The University creates and maintains high-value public records in relation to:

- Qualifications and academic records of students
- Records of programmes and courses
- Student administration
- Audit and governance documents
- Board and committee meeting minutes, including those of the University's Council and Senate
- Historic documents from the founding of the University

The University maintains its information on various systems including a student management system, financial management system, human resources system, web content management system as well as Microsoft 365 and SharePoint.

The University employs 5985 full-time staff. Following a decentralised approach to information management, responsibility for information management is delegated to the University's various service divisions and faculties. The University's Records Management team comprises the Records Manager and University Archivist (Records Manager) and Records Management Adviser. They provide the framework and guidance to ensure the University meets its Public Records Act (PRA) requirements.

The University maintains a mix of physical and digital records and uses a third-party provider for destruction and storage of physical records.

The University's information management maturity is summarised below. Further detail on each of the maturity assessments can be found in Sections 4 and 5 of this report.

Beginning	2
Progressing	10
Managing	7
Maturing	1
Optimising	0





2. Introduction

KPMG was commissioned by Te Rua Mahara to undertake an independent audit of the University of Auckland Waipapa Taumata Rau (the University) under section 33 of the PRA. The audit took place in March 2023.

The University's information management (IM) practices were audited against the PRA and the requirements in the [Information and records management standard](#) (the Standard) as set out in Archives Information Management Maturity Assessment.

Te Rua Mahara provides the framework and specifies the audit plan and areas of focus for auditors. Te Rua Mahara also provides administrative support for the auditors as they undertake the independent component of the audit process. The auditors are primarily responsible for the onsite audit, assessing against the standard, and writing the audit report. Te Rua Mahara is responsible for following up on the report's recommendations with your organisation.

3. This audit

This audit covers all public records held by the University, including both physical and digital information. The following records were not included in the scope of this audit due to not being covered under the PRA:

- teaching materials of staff, used to deliver lectures or other presentations
- research outputs generated by staff or students including (but not exclusively) raw data, analysed data, working notes and publications (i.e., research materials, books, research papers whether published or not)
- information and records of subsidiary companies where the University holds or controls 50 percent or less of the company.

The audit involved reviews of selected documentation, interviews with selected staff, including the Executive Sponsor, information management staff, the Information Technology (IT) team, and a sample of other staff members from various areas of the University. Note that the Executive Sponsor is the Senior Responsible Officer for the audit.

The audit reviewed the University's information management practices against the PRA and the requirements in the Information management and records standard and provides an assessment of current state maturity. As part of this audit, we completed systems assessments over the University's key systems that act as a repository for public records. The systems assessed were Microsoft 365, Outlook and the University's human resources system. Where recommendations have been made, these are intended to strengthen the current state of maturity or to assist with moving to the next level of maturity.

The summary of maturity ratings can be found at Section 4, with detailed findings and recommendations following in Section 5. The University has reviewed the draft report, and a summary of its comments can be found in Section 6.

4. Maturity Assessment

This section lists all assessed maturity levels by topic area in a table format, refer to Appendix 1 for an accessible description of the table. For further context about how each maturity level assessment has been made, refer to the relevant topic area in the report in Section 5.

Category	No.	Topic	Maturity				
			Beginning	Progressing	Managing	Maturing	Optimising
Governance							
	1	IM strategy			●		
	2	IM policy and processes			●		
	3	Governance arrangements and Executive Sponsor				●	
	4	IM integration into business processes			●		
	5	Outsourced functions and collaborative arrangements	●				
	6	Te Tiriti o Waitangi		●			
Self-monitoring							
	7	Self-monitoring		●			
Capability							
	8	Capacity and capability			●		
	9	IM roles and responsibilities		●			
Creation							
	10	Creation and capture of information			●		
	11	High-value / high-risk information		●			
Management							
	12	IM requirements built into technology systems		●			
	13	Integrity of information			●		
	14	Information maintenance and accessibility		●			
	15	Business continuity and recovery		●			
Storage							
	16	Appropriate storage arrangements		●			
Access							
	18	Information access, use and sharing		●			
Disposal							
	20	Current organisation-specific disposal authorities			●		
	21	Implementation of disposal decisions		●			
	22	Transfer to Te Rua Mahara	●				

Please note: Topics 17 and 19 in the Information Management Maturity Assessment are applicable to local authorities only and have therefore not been assessed.

5. Audit findings by category and topic



Governance

The management of information is a discipline that needs to be owned from the top down within a public office. The topics covered in the governance category are those that need senior-level vision and support to ensure that government information is managed to ensure effective business outcomes for the public office, our government, and New Zealanders.

TOPIC 1 – IM strategy

Managing

Summary of findings

The University does not have a specific IM strategy. Instead, the University has a collection of documents that effectively make up its information management strategy. These include:

- *Taumata Teitei – Vision 2030 and Strategic Plan 2025*
- *Te Rautaki Matihiko – Digital Strategy 2025*
- *Te Rautaki Raraunga – Data Strategy.*

Interviews with staff confirmed these strategies have been reviewed by governance forums such as the Public Records Steering Group Committee (PRSG) and the Digital Enablement Committee (DEC).

The strategies set out the University's vision and desired future state. They also provide strategic direction on information management at the University. However, based on the guidance of Te Rua Mahara, there were elements missing across the strategies. For example, the strategies did not include how success would be measured or the approval, date of publication and review cycle. The strategies also focussed on digital information and did not outline key objectives for physical records.

The University does have a separate '*Information Management Business Capability Roadmap*' which shows the initiatives and implementation activities across different timeframes. In addition, Taumata Teitei mentions plans to develop an institutional information management framework to 'guide the ethical acquisition, structure, storage and utilisation of institutional data assets [including information]'. There is an opportunity for this framework to consolidate aspects from the strategies and documents that make up the University's information management 'strategy' and to capture the information management strategy elements missing across the University's strategies.

Recommendation

Develop the institutional information management framework to provide centralised strategic guidance for information management. Ensure missing elements as per the guidance of Te Rua

Mahara are captured, such as an implementation plan for information management initiatives, and how success will be measured.

TOPIC 2 – IM policy and processes

Managing

Summary of findings

The University's information management policy, the *'Records Management Policy'*, was last updated and approved by the Vice-Chancellor in September 2022. It is available to all staff and contractors on the Records Management and Policy Hub intranet pages. The policy's content is managed by the Records Manager and is consistent with relevant legislation and the Standard. It also links to other University policies such the *'Privacy Policy'* and *'Data Governance Policy'*. It includes roles and responsibilities for all staff, with specific responsibilities for line managers, business owners and the Records Manager. Information management responsibilities are included in information management roles, but not for all staff.

The policy is supported by localised procedural documents, process maps and staff-created procedural guidance (known as wikis) which include specific information management practices that individual service divisions and faculties must follow. These include guidance documents for processes such as *'Add an Application'* for admissions and *'Privacy Impact Assessment Checklist'* for initiatives that involve personal information. Guidance on handling information created or stored by departing staff members is also outlined on the Intranet.

Recommendation

Include information management responsibilities in all staff position descriptions going forward (in connection with *Topic 9 - IM roles and responsibilities*).

TOPIC 3 – Governance arrangements and Executive Sponsor

Maturing

Summary of findings

The University has a dedicated information management governance group, the PRSG Committee, which is chaired by the Executive Sponsor. The PRSG Committee meets five times a year and the meetings include reporting from the Records Manager on information management initiatives that have taken place since the last committee meeting, including those that are identified in Taumata Teitei. Any issues, concerns or proposed initiatives for the future are also discussed at this forum. For example, the PRSG Committee discussed the decision to adopt the government's information classification scheme within SharePoint, and add in retention labels and a notifications functionality which align with the classifications to inform the records management team when information is eligible for deletion.

The Executive Sponsor actively promotes the value and importance of information management to the senior leadership team and the wider organisation. Interviews highlighted that the Executive Sponsor is supportive of information management matters and meets every week with the Records Manager to discuss operational and strategic matters relating to information management. Additionally, the Executive Sponsor regularly engages with senior

colleagues to keep them aware of information management issues and how they can support the Records Management team. This is done through the professional leaders' meetings, informal networking opportunities and other forums. The Executive Sponsor has not however had similar opportunities to network regularly with other Executive Sponsors in their sector.

Recommendation

The Executive Sponsor should actively work with other Executive Sponsors in their sector.

TOPIC 4 – IM integration into business processes

Managing

Summary of findings

Responsibility for the management of information within the University is consistently assigned to business owners, deans, and directors under the Records Management Policy. Senior and operational staff interviewed demonstrated a strong awareness of their responsibility to integrate information management into business processes and activities.

Non-compliance with information management requirements embedded in business processes would be addressed internally, between line managers and the relevant stakeholders. Guidance can also be sought from the Records Manager and the Enterprise Architecture team if information management expertise was required. Information management guidance pages and documents by the Records Management team are also available on the staff intranet.

Information management requirements are integrated into core business processes and activities. Due to the University's decentralised operating model and limited capacity in the Records Management team in the past, business process changes have at times been managed without involving information management expertise. However, information management expertise is always involved for system changes. With the recent hiring of the Records Management Adviser and plans to recruit an Archivist (refer to *Topic 8 – Capacity and capability*), Records Management staff can offer expertise more regularly.

Recommendation

Ensure information management expertise is included in all business process change and development going forward.

TOPIC 5 – Outsourced functions and collaborative arrangements

Beginning

Summary of findings

The University does not outsource functions as per the definition of Te Rua Mahara, it only outsources certain activities within functions.

Requirements for managing information are detailed in some but not all contracts with third parties for collaborative arrangements or outsourced activities. Of the two contracts sampled, one contained a clause relating to records and audits specifying that the provider must keep full, accurate and up-to-date records. One of the contracts related to services that were to be performed on University systems where the University held the records throughout the contract's duration. The second contract related to the production of records that were to be

provided to the University at the end of the project. This contract lacked clear clauses recognising the public record status of the records being created and held by the contracted party during the project.

Monitoring of contracted parties to ensure information management requirements are met is currently limited. Inbuilt information management controls were noted for a system used by one of the contracted parties, where transaction data is entered directly into the University's business system and retained in line with PRA requirements. Besides this, the University also relies on the requirement of contracted parties to comply with its policies and New Zealand law, as stated within the contracts sampled, to help ensure compliance with the PRA.

Recommendation

Develop standardised information management requirements that can be used when creating contracts for outsourced activities and collaborative agreements where public records are created and managed.

TOPIC 6 – Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Progressing

Summary of findings

Records Management staff expressed their desire to start on the process of locating and identifying information of importance to Māori. The Poutiaki Rangahau Māori – Māori Research and Data Sovereignty Steward from the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor Māori has been identified as a person that can drive work in this area in future. The Poutiaki Rangahau Māori will also help operationalise the University's commitment in Taumata Teitei to becoming a Māori Data Sovereignty organisation that undertakes its activities in a way which reflects its commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the principles of Māori Data Sovereignty. Additionally, Records Management staff were interested in developing a framework in future to assist with identifying information of importance to Māori, with other universities in the New Zealand Universities Records Management forum. This area of work has also been identified as a priority workstream in the University's records management roadmap.

For systems containing unstructured information, for example SharePoint, metadata and tags can be manually added to help identify information of importance to Māori. As part of a project on digitising physical information, the Records Management team plans to prioritise information of value to Māori.

Records Management staff acknowledged the information management implications of the University's agreements with Māori. These are also covered at a high-level in the Taumata Teitei as discussed above.

Recommendation

Work in consultation with the Office of the Pro-Vice Chancellor Māori to formally define and identify information of importance to Māori.



Self-monitoring

Public offices are responsible for measuring and monitoring their information management performance for planning and improvement purposes. This helps to ensure that IM systems and processes are working effectively and efficiently. It also ensures that public offices are meeting the mandatory Information and records management standard as well as their own internal policies and processes.

TOPIC 7 – Self-monitoring

Progressing

Summary of findings

Due to the organisation's size, numerous systems and decentralised nature, compliance with internal information management policies and processes is not centrally monitored. Self-monitoring is the responsibility of the service divisions and faculties to carry out, as required. There are plans to implement a biannual monitoring programme in the future.

If staff were found to have transgressed information management policies and procedures, they would be educated about these. Although severe issues may be reported to the relevant governance group, minor issues are dealt with within service divisions and functions, with relevant stakeholders resolving them with colleagues and line managers, as needed. Staff interviewed mentioned they are comfortable in seeking help from the Records Management team if there are any issues or queries. Any serious issues escalated to the Records Management or Digital Services teams would be reported and discussed at the PRSG Committee and DEC, whose membership includes the Chief Information Security Officer.

The University also participates in an annual information management survey conducted by Te Rua Mahara, with input from various stakeholders and subject experts. Results of these surveys are also discussed at the PRSG Committee and DEC and last year, it resulted in the approval and funding of two new positions in the Records Management team (refer to *Topic 8 – Capacity and Capability*).

Recommendation

Design and implement regular information management monitoring procedures across service divisions and faculties, and report on findings to the Executive Sponsor.

Capability



Information underpins everything our public offices do and impacts all functions and all staff within the public office. Effective management of information requires a breadth of experience and expertise for IM practitioners. Information is a core asset and all staff need to understand how managing information as an asset will make a difference to business outcomes.

TOPIC 8 – Capacity and capability

Managing

Summary of findings

The University uses completion of the annual Te Rua Mahara information management survey to consider future planning for information management capacity. Last year's survey highlighted that the University had been under-resourced in information management expertise. In response, a benchmarking exercise was carried out to compare the University to similarly sized Australasian universities in terms of the number of information management roles. Following this, two new positions were created within the Records Management team to bring the University in line with similar universities. The Records Management Adviser commenced employment at the University in January 2023 and an Archivist role is expected to be filled in the near future. This will enable the Records Manager to allocate more of their time to providing strategic direction and increasing involvement in information management initiatives. For example, there is a plan to engage with faculties later this year to determine the support that they would like from the Records Management team.

The University has appropriate information management staff capability to support staff with day-to-day information management activities and initiatives. Both the Records Manager and the Records Management Adviser have master's degrees in records management and are experienced professionals in information management. The Records Management team also have access to professional development opportunities including training, conferences, and forums such as the New Zealand Universities Records Management forum.

The Records Manager advised that their position description is reviewed as part of the annual goal setting process and assessed for alignment with current and future organisational needs.

Recommendation

Assess information management staff's position descriptions regularly to ensure that current and future business needs are met including access to broader professional development opportunities such as Te ao Māori and risk management.

TOPIC 9 – IM roles and responsibilities

Progressing

Summary of findings

University staff have an awareness and understanding of their information management responsibilities, which is communicated to them through induction training for new starters, University intranet pages and Policy Hub, and internal emails.

Position descriptions and performance plans do not document information management roles and responsibilities for all staff and contractors. From the sample of four position descriptions reviewed for general staff positions, information management duties were not detailed in the position description for one role. The requirement for compliance with all University policies, including the Information Management Policy, is detailed within the Code of Conduct.

There is a formal induction process for all new starters at the University where staff are taken through all the relevant policies and procedures for their service division and/or faculty. Information management training is incorporated into other training specific to the new joiner’s service division or faculty such as training on how to use the student management system. The Records Management team is also regularly contacted for advice by staff when required and provides comprehensive advice on the intranet. The University offers workshops and a ‘Records Management at the University of Auckland’ course held twice a year, but these are one-off and optional. There is no formal regular and ongoing information management training offered to University staff and contractors specific to their roles. The new Records Management Adviser is working on developing a comprehensive training programme for information management tailored to local needs which includes short, ‘bite-sized’ training such as videos and modules.

Recommendation

Develop and deliver regular on-going information management training specific to staff and contractors.

Creation

It is important to take a systematic approach to the management of government information, and this starts with an understanding of what information must be created and captured. It is expected that public offices create and capture complete and accurate documentation of the policies, actions and transactions of government. Knowing what information assets are held by public offices is essential to IM practice.



TOPIC 10 – Creation and capture of information

Managing

Summary of findings

University staff indicated they understand and comply with their obligations to create full and accurate records.

Information is routinely created and captured as part of business activities by all service divisions and faculties. All staff interviewed said they understood how to create and capture information in the business systems relevant to their service division or faculty. Due to the size and complexity the organisation, each service division or faculty has localised filing structures and document naming conventions to store records. Staff interviewed stated they generally consider records to be reliable and trustworthy.

Staff create, store, and manage information within controlled environments, such as their respective business systems, to help ensure usability and reliability. For example, the Finance, Student Management and Human Resources service divisions are mandated to store all their information in the relevant business systems. SharePoint and network drives have been configured to not allow records to be transferred onto external hard drives. Security settings for SharePoint sites containing high-risk and high-value records are controlled further with only authorised users having read and/or write access.

The metadata captured is dependent on the system being used. For example, network drives and legacy systems do not comply with Te Rua Mahara minimum metadata requirements. However, there are plans to decommission legacy systems over time and migrate information from network drives into SharePoint, which does meet the Te Rua Mahara minimum metadata requirements (refer to *Topic 18 - Information access, use and sharing*).

Recommendation

Transition away from the remaining legacy systems over time, to systems that capture appropriate metadata to support the usability, reliability, and trustworthiness of the information.

TOPIC 11 – High-value / high-risk information

Progressing

Summary of findings

Records management staff are aware of the information assets held by the University although this is not documented in an exhaustive information asset register of physical and digital records.

Records management staff had a good understanding of the information that would constitute high-value or high-risk information. This understanding largely arises from a survey the University conducted in 2018 to identify high-value and high-risk records, and the digital systems that held them. The report from this survey also identifies the specific nature of the digital records. However, high-value and high-risk physical records are not identified.

Recommendation

Develop and maintain an information asset register that identifies physical information held by the University that is of high-value or high-risk.

Management

Management of information should be designed into systems to ensure its ongoing management and access over time, including following a business disruption event. Information must be reliable, trustworthy and complete and managed to ensure it is easy to find, retrieve and use, as well as protected and secure.



Summary of findings

Information management expertise is involved in the design and configuration of most new and upgraded business systems. For example, the Records Manager was involved in information management consultations about recordkeeping requirements prior to the implementation of the secure case management system for student welfare and non-academic misconduct. Design specifications and requirements were considered as part of the upgrade and considerations of retention periods, appropriate safeguards, and deletion requests were built into the system. However, standardised information management requirements for new and upgraded business systems are not documented.

SharePoint automatically captures the minimum metadata requirements set out by Te Rua Mahara. However, the University's other systems were not designed to capture this metadata. Digital Services staff advised it is not always possible for information management requirements to be incorporated into off-the-shelf business systems due to a lack of functionality or a lack of alignment with New Zealand-specific recordkeeping practices, and the lack of alternate systems.

System design and configurations are fully documented for critical systems but are not documented for all legacy systems.

Recommendation

Create standardised information requirements for new and upgraded business systems and ensure formal inclusion of IM staff as part of this process.

Summary of findings

Staff interviewed generally had positive experiences when searching and retrieving information from the University's systems, particularly with newer information. However, staff did identify that it is sometimes easier to consult the owner of information managed by another service division or faculty rather than searching for it themselves. This is particularly the case when the information is stored in a different business system. There are folder structures and localised naming conventions within network drives and SharePoint, along with procedural documents, process maps and wikis to guide staff on how to create and save information. These are socialised during staff and contractor onboarding, depending on the relevance to their role.

Staff expressed confidence that information that is retrieved and used is reliable and complete. Certain records are saved in business systems with structured fields which makes it easier to locate information for example in the human resources system. SharePoint automatically records metadata which provides staff with automatic document versioning, comprehensive audit trails and role-based permissions. Due to SharePoint's additional functionalities compared

to network drives, plans are underway to use SharePoint as the University's preferred file storage location more widely across the organisation. This will enable easier searching due to SharePoint's functionality.

Recommendation

Ensure the transition to SharePoint addresses any identified issues with finding and retrieving information, such as standardising file structures and naming conventions.

TOPIC 14 – Information maintenance and accessibility

Progressing

Summary of findings

There are strategies in place to manage and maintain digital information during some business and system change projects. For example, there is a strategic roadmap which outlines a future phased migration from the University's current human resources, finance, and student information management systems. The roadmap states that protection and preservation of information maintained within these systems will be considered throughout the migration. Business system changes require the development of migration plans and the performance of data validation after migration, in line with the Data Strategy.

Access to the onsite physical information is managed by the Records Manager (refer to *Topic 16 – Appropriate storage arrangements*). Physical information is starting to be digitised. Risks for the ongoing accessibility of physical information have been identified, such as the risk of flooding and asbestos. There are asbestos management plans for the latter which outline asbestos-containing materials identified in buildings, inspection schedules and staff roles and responsibilities. However, flooding risk and other risks have not been documented in a hazard register nor is there a documented strategy for managing risks to and maintaining physical information.

Technology obsolescence risks affecting accessibility and preservation of digital information are identified. The Enterprise Architecture Manager has created a list of systems at risk of technological obsolescence with a description of their current condition and the future plan for migrating information from these systems. The University uses public cloud services and can maintain information for as long as required.

Recommendation

Establish a periodic review of ongoing accessibility risks and preservation needs for physical and digital information.

TOPIC 15 – Business continuity and recovery

Progressing

Summary of findings

The University has 28 individual business continuity plans (BCPs) for different service divisions and faculties across the organisation, as well as disaster recovery documents to aid with restoration of digital information. Physical information is not covered in BCPs, although this is

no longer relevant for most service divisions and faculties as most information created by the University is now digital with the recent focus on digitising physical information, for example, physical Human Resource (HR) records. The BCP documents also outline roles and responsibilities, overviews the Business Continuity Management (BCM) lifecycle and describes how to activate BCPs.

For this audit, two BCPs were assessed and reviewed, the Digital Services BCP and the Libraries and Learning Services BCP. Both identified critical business processes and critical information asset types. The criticality of business processes and the strategies for managing disruption to them is also discussed. Both BCPs were up to date and had been reviewed by the BCP Owners within the last two years.

The IT staff focus group advised that there is variability in the testing of BCPs across the service divisions and faculties. Although all BCPs were tested during the COVID-19 lockdowns and extreme weather events, not all service divisions and faculties have a defined testing cycle that specifies when the testing is to be completed and for which applications as part of business-as-usual activities. Where ad-hoc testing is completed, a debrief report is always produced, detailing relevant action plans to address any issues identified.

Recommendation

Ensure that business continuity plans for all service divisions and faculties are tested regularly.

Storage



Good storage is a very important factor for information protection and security. Appropriate storage arrangements for both physical and digital information ensures information remains accessible and usable for as long as it is required for business and legal purposes and for accountable government.

TOPIC 16 – Appropriate storage arrangements

Progressing

Summary of findings

The University has protection and security controls in place for physical and digital information. Physical information is stored locally at the University's premises¹ and at offsite commercial storage facilities. Information in the records management programme room is appropriately labelled and protected against hazards such as fire, with the room and two adjacent storerooms

¹ Note that KPMG were unable to examine the University's primary on-campus records storage space as it experienced flooding following the extreme rainfall in Auckland in January 2023. The Records Manager advised that none of the records were damaged as they were all above the water line. The physical storage inspection instead focussed on the records management programme room and adjoining storerooms on campus, which houses approximately 10% of the University's physical information. Although there was also minor water ingress in the records management programme room because of the rainfall, no records were affected. Records in this room and the storerooms were able to be assessed.

having fire alarms and a fire extinguisher installed. Access to the rooms is restricted via a key and pin code, with the two keys allocated to appropriate personnel. Any staff members requiring access to the room must be accompanied by the Records Manager and there are cameras securing the room and adjoining storerooms. However, it was noted that due to the extreme rainfall in Auckland in January 2023, there was a minor water ingress in the records management programme room which led to one wall and a small patch of carpet getting wet at the time. No records were damaged as they were on the shelves in the storerooms which were unaffected.

There is protection and security in place for digital information against unauthorised access, loss or destruction. Digital information is backed up regularly for the various business systems used and is stored in data centres at the University’s Auckland and Tamaki campuses, or in the cloud. There is only a soft delete option on SharePoint, which initiates a workflow approval process for the Records Manager before permanent deletion. Role-based access controls to systems restrict unauthorised personnel from accessing records. An authentication report is run daily which show suspicious authentication behaviours such as users with multiple authentication failures, and log in attempts from IP addresses that have been associated with fraudulent behaviour in the past. Such instances are followed up by the Digital Services Cybersecurity team by contacting the affected user(s) and resetting their password, if needed.

Staff noted that network are regularly used although these are controlled from a security and access perspective, where access is only provisioned to staff where necessary and after managerial approvals. There is a plan for migrating information currently on network drives to SharePoint.

Recommendation

Assess and document flooding hazard in physical storage areas and plan remediation activity (if not already underway).

Access



Ongoing access to and use of information enables staff to do their work and the public to hold government accountable. To facilitate this, public offices need mechanisms for finding and using this information efficiently. Information and/or data sharing between public offices and with external organisations should be documented in specific information sharing agreements.

TOPIC 18 – Information access, use and sharing

Progressing

Summary of findings

Staff have a good awareness of the systems and tools that capture and facilitate access to information. Localised practices and requirements for managing information are covered during inductions and ad-hoc information management training.

Role-based access to systems is provided to staff, operating on a principle of least privilege. For example, the Staff Services team have the ability to grant access to the core student information management system, but they do not have access to the system themselves as their role does not require it. Interviewed staff advised that user access is generally granted relatively quickly once staff have requested for and received approval from the person responsible for the system.

Staff are largely reliant on the automatic capture of metadata and very few staff interviewed had recorded additional metadata manually. As legacy systems get decommissioned, SharePoint will become the required location for staff to store unstructured information and this will boost findability of information using automatically captured metadata. There is a migration plan developed by the Digital Services team to transfer information from network drives into SharePoint. A SharePoint pilot is also underway to implement manual and automated classification of records to reduce the filing burden on staff. Both initiatives should help progress maturity in this topic.

There is little information sharing externally at the University. Interviewed staff advised that when they did need to share information with a third party, they would usually share information securely, for example using secure transfer folders and external SharePoint sites. Email transfers are discouraged.

Recommendation

Review ontology/taxonomy/file plan/metadata schema applied in systems to facilitate consistent management and discovery of information.

Disposal



Disposal activity must be authorised by the Chief Archivist under the Public Records Act. Public offices should have their own specific disposal authority as well as actively use the General Disposal Authorities for disposal of general or more ephemeral information. Disposal should be carried out routinely. Information of archival value, both physical and digital, should be regularly transferred to Te Rua Mahara (or have a deferral of transfer) and be determined as either “open access” or “restricted access”.

TOPIC 20 – Current organisation-specific disposal authorities

Managing

Summary of findings

The University is part of a Disposal Authority (DA702) that applies to eight New Zealand universities. It was authorised in 2021 and the next review is scheduled for 2031. The disposal authority covers all information formats and functions. The University is also covered by the General Disposal Authorities 6 and 7.

Given that DA702 is relevant to multiple universities, the University does not have a regular review cycle to ensure that the disposal authority reflects business and legislative changes. If any revisions to the disposal authority were considered necessary, the Records Manager would

raise it with other Records Managers at the New Zealand Universities Records Management forum.

Guidance and resources on disposal are available on the intranet and staff regularly consult the Records Manager to confirm disposal requirements for documents. While staff and contractors have a general awareness of their responsibilities regarding disposal of information, there is an opportunity to uplift their understanding of the disposal requirements by introducing formal training for staff, for example.

Recommendation

Ensure staff and contractors understand the disposal requirements relevant to the information they create and use.

TOPIC 21 – Implementation of disposal decisions

Progressing

Summary of findings

The University has processes in place to ensure information is retained for as long as required for business use and as identified in the applicable disposal authorities (as outlined in *Topic 20 - Current organisation-specific disposal authorities*). DA702 is published on the records management staff intranet site along with various other resources to provide staff with guidance on the disposal of information. Disposal of information subject to DA702 requires staff to complete a 'Records Destruction Authorisation Form'. This form must be signed off by the head of the relevant service division or faculty before disposal actions are taken.

Physical information is destroyed in a secure, complete, and irreversible manner by a third-party provider. The Records Manager receives quarterly reports from third-party storage facility on overdue items for destruction and holdings transferred offsite by various service divisions or faculties.

Disposal actions for physical and digital information are carried out regularly by certain service divisions and faculties, for example the Elam School of Fine Arts and the Finance service division. However, Records Management staff noted a general reluctance to dispose of digital information. This is partly due to the metadata configuration and business logic on legacy systems being complex and not conducive to staff being able to easily identify information that is eligible for disposal.

Retention requirements for digital information are built into systems containing structured information, such as the finance system. The SharePoint pilot project will allow users to define how long documents should be retained after its last edit in accordance with DA702. A proof of concept has been developed with a contractor for automatic disposal which will route documents to the Records Management team to approve for deletion once the retention period has elapsed. Deletion of information from business systems is not irreversible as it can still be restored from backups and data tapes for that system.

Recommendation

Develop a plan to ensure disposal actions are routinely carried out for both physical and digital information by all service divisions and faculties, including offering training to relevant staff to encourage disposal of information where possible.

TOPIC 22 – Transfer to Te Rua Mahara

Beginning

Summary of findings

The University has not carried out an assessment to identify all digital information of archival value that is over 25 years old. The types of physical information of archival value and over 25 years old were identified during the 2018 survey of high-value and high-risk records. These information types are documented in a list, which also outlines whether the information is classified open or restricted. Examples include council minutes, student administration records and documents from the founding of the University.

The University had held a deferral of transfer for information that was due for transfer until its expiry in 2015. The University intends to renew this deferral. The University has identified an ongoing business need to retain certain records it holds that are more than 25 years of age. Documents that will fall under this request for deferral include documents that form the University's cultural heritage and are in high demand by researchers and services divisions to support decision-making. As a result, there is currently no plan on future transfers of physical or digital information.

Recommendation

Discuss with Te Rua Mahara whether there are justifications for a proposed deferral of transfer of the mandatory transfer of records that is required by the PRA.

6. Summary of feedback

The University of Auckland Waipapa Taumata Rau would like to thank the audit team for their time and effort in conducting this assessment of recordkeeping practices for Te Rua Mahara.

Waipapa Taumata Rau mostly agrees with the audit findings but has some concerns that undue weighting was applied to isolated examples of practice. Given the ongoing transition to digital records and the reliance on business information systems for core functions, the University hopes that future guidance and audits by Te Rua Mahara will prioritise these areas.

The recommendations from the audit will be added to the records management roadmap and a programme of works will be developed in collaboration with Te Rua Mahara.

7. Appendix 1

The table in Section 4, on page 3 lists all assessed maturity levels by topic area in a table format. This table has been listed below for accessibility purposes:

Topic 1, IM strategy – Managing

Topic 2, IM policy and processes – Managing

Topic 3, Governance arrangements & Executive Sponsor – Maturing

Topic 4, IM integration into business processes – Managing

Topic 5, Outsourced functions and collaborative arrangements - Beginning

Topic 6, Te Tiriti o Waitangi – Progressing

Topic 7, Self-monitoring – Progressing

Topic 8, Capability and capacity - Managing

Topic 9, IM roles and responsibilities - Progressing

Topic 10, Creation and capture of information - Managing

Topic 11, High-value / high-risk information - Progressing

Topic 12, IM requirements built into technology systems - Progressing

Topic 13, Integrity of information - Managing

Topic 14, Information maintenance and accessibility - Progressing

Topic 15, Business continuity and recovery – Progressing

Topic 16, Appropriate storage arrangements – Progressing

Topic 18, Information access, use and sharing – Progressing

Topic 20, Current organisation-specific disposal authorities – Managing

Topic 21, Implementation of disposal decisions – Progressing

Topic 22, Transfer to Te Rua Mahara – Beginning

kpmg.com/nz



1 March 2024

Te Rua Mahara o te Kāwanatanga Archives New Zealand

10 Mulgrave Street

Wellington

Phone +64 499 5595

Websites www.archives.govt.nz

www.dia.govt.nz

Dawn Freshwater
Vice-Chancellor
University of Auckland
vice-chancellor@auckland.ac.nz

E te rangatira e Dawn, tēnā koe

Nā te kaha o te kōrero i whitiwhiti ai, ka whai anō te ara pai mā tātou katoa. He waka eke noa tātou, ka mihi.

Public Records Act 2005 Audit Recommendations

This letter contains my recommendations related to the recent independent audit of the University of Auckland Waipapa Taumata Rau (the University) completed by KPMG under section 33 of the Public Records Act 2005 (PRA). Thank you for making your staff and resources available to support the audit process.

Introduction

Te Rua Mahara o te Kāwanatanga Archives New Zealand (Te Rua Mahara) is mandated by the PRA to regulate public sector information management (IM). The audit programme is a key regulatory tool in our Monitoring Framework.

Monitoring IM practice across the public sector gives assurance that the government is open, transparent and accountable by providing visibility of public sector IM practices. Full, accurate and accessible information improves business efficiency and government decision-making and accountability, which in turn enhances public trust and confidence. Information that is well managed unlocks the value of government information for the benefit of everyone.

We are confident that you and your organisation are committed to delivering high-quality, trusted information to decision-makers, other government organisations, customers' and stakeholders. We trust that the audit process will support this commitment. The audit report and this letter recommend changes to support improvement of your organisation's IM practices.

Kia pono ai te rua Mahara – Enabling trusted government information

Auckland Regional Office, 95 Richard Pearse Drive, Mangere, Auckland
Christchurch Regional Office, 15 Harvard Avenue, Wigram, Christchurch
Dunedin Regional Office, 556 George Street, Dunedin

Audit findings

In the audit report, the auditor has independently assessed your information maturity against the framework of our IM Maturity Assessment. Prior to the audit, your organisation completed the Maturity Assessment. This provided a self-assessment of IM maturity for your own use and as context for the auditor about your organisation.

Organisations that are assessed as having a maturity level of 'Managing' across all IM topics are broadly meeting the minimum requirements expected by the PRA and the mandatory Information and records management standard. The University's IM is assessed as mostly at the 'Progressing' level.

With the recent increase in staff the University has better resourcing support for IM. I encourage continual assessment of the level of IM resourcing to ensure improvement to the 'Managing' level at least. Monitoring across this large university is essential for quality assurance in this IM distributed model. Some standardisations can be implemented across the service divisions and faculties to improve findability and ensure good practice.

For the University, physical information of archival value is transferred to our Auckland repository. The University should develop and implement a disposal plan, which would include physical and digital transfers to Te Rua Mahara. I encourage discussion about this with our Auckland regional office for physical transfers and our Disposal and Acquisition team for digital.

We would welcome discussion of the University's views on the development of our guidance. There is opportunity for this during the audit followup process.

Prioritised recommendations

The audit report lists 20 recommendations to improve your organisation's IM maturity.

We endorse all recommendations as appropriate and relevant. To focus your IM improvement programme, we consider that your organisation should prioritise the nine recommendations as identified in the Appendix.

What will happen next

The audit report and this letter will be proactively released on our website shortly. We would be grateful if you would advise of any redactions that your organisation considers are necessary within 10 working days.

As required by the PRA, I will also provide the Minister of Internal Affairs with a report on the results of the audit programme for each financial year, which is tabled in the House of Representatives.

We will follow up this letter with a request to your Executive Sponsor that your organisation provides us with an action plan to address the prioritised recommendations. Our follow up process will track your progress against the action plan.

Thank you again for your support with the audit. We would greatly appreciate further feedback on the audit process and the value it provides to organisations. We have sent a feedback survey link for the attention of your Executive Sponsor in the accompanying email.

Nāku iti noa, nā

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AR' followed by a stylized flourish.

Anahera Morehu
Poumanaaki Chief Archivist
Te Rua Mahara o te Kāwanatanga Archives New Zealand

Cc Hester Mountfield, Associate Director, Research and Collections, (Executive Sponsor),
h.mountifield@auckland.ac.nz

APPENDIX

Category	Topic Number	Auditor's Recommendation	Comments from Te Rua Mahara
Governance	5: Outsourced functions and collaborative arrangements	<i>Develop standardised information management requirements that can be used when creating contacts for outsourced activities and collaborative agreements where public records are created and managed.</i>	It is important that all parties are clear on their roles and responsibilities for information created under contracts and agreements and that monitoring provides assurance that the requirements are met.
Governance	6: Te Tiriti o Waitangi	<i>Work in consultation with the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor Māori to formally define and identify information of importance to Māori.</i>	As suggested by the University's Records Management staff this would also be useful to work on with others in the New Zealand Universities Records Management forum.
Self-monitoring	7: Self-monitoring	<i>Design and implement regular information management monitoring procedures across service divisions and faculties, and report on findings to the Executive Sponsor.</i>	This is essential to identify trends in activity and to identify where IM practice improvements can be made. Also enables reporting to management and increase in IM awareness across the organisation.
Capability	9: IM roles and responsibilities	<i>Develop and deliver regular on-going information management training specific to staff and contractors.</i>	Training is provided so that staff and contractors are supported to use the systems as expected and to understand their role and responsibilities with IM.
Creation	11: High-value/high-risk information	<i>Develop and maintain an information asset register that identifies physical information held by University that is of high-value or high-risk.</i>	This would also be a useful activity (for both digital and physical records) to work on with the New Zealand Universities Records Management forum and when completed can help the University to prioritise IM activity.

Category	Topic Number	Auditor's Recommendation	Comments from Te Rua Mahara
Management	13: Integrity of information	<i>Ensure the transition to SharePoint addresses any identified issues with finding and retrieving information, such as standardising file structures and naming conventions.</i>	Decommissioning the network drives is recommended. This decreases the risk of staff using the partially controlled network drives and effort can be concentrated on improving SharePoint.
Storage	16: Appropriate storage arrangements	<i>Assess and document flooding hazard in physical storage areas and plan remediation activity (if not already underway).</i>	Also assess if records held there are necessary to be kept onsite or can be sent to offsite storage or destroyed if appropriate.
Disposal	21: Implementation of disposal decisions	<i>Develop a plan to ensure disposal actions are routinely carried out for both physical and digital information by all service divisions and faculties, including offering training to relevant staff to encourage disposal of information where possible.</i>	This is an important activity as it helps the organisation manage the risk of over retention of information as well as improving findability of relevant information.
Disposal	22: Transfer to Archives	<i>Discuss with Te Rua Mahara whether there are justifications for a proposed deferral of transfer of the mandatory transfer of records that is required by the PRA.</i>	Discuss with Te Rua Mahara the implementation of digital transfers and physically transfer to Te Rua Mahara Auckland regional office.