



Root Causes of the Barriers that prevent Information from being managed as a Business Asset

29th March 2017 – Danette McGilvray, James Price and Tom Redman. Based on research into the “Barriers to and benefits of managing information as a business asset” by Dr Nina Evans and James Price

© EXPERIENCE MATTERS PTY LTD 2017

This presentation, including any supporting materials, is owned by Experience Matters. Experience Matters grants the right for public use provided the source is acknowledged. Permission by the authors is required for commercial use.



James Price



@rethinkinfo

Root causes

Five categories:

1. Lack of executive awareness
2. Lack of business governance
3. Inadequate leadership and management
4. Justification is difficult
5. Inappropriate or ineffective instruments



Lack of executive awareness

There is a lack of executive awareness:

- That information *can be* a valuable asset
- That information can be *managed* as an asset
- Of the *importance* of managing information as an asset
- Of *how* to manage information assets
- That information \neq technology
- Of new approaches to solving problems

This is caused by:

- A lack of formal secondary and tertiary education
- Insufficient on the job training
- Failure of induction



Lack of business governance

There is a lack of:

- Board appointed *accountability* for information management. Unlike money, nobody will be sacked if information isn't managed and delivered appropriately
- Definition of the *ownership* of information assets
- Definition of *authority, roles and responsibilities* for managing information assets
- *Measurement* of
 - information quality
 - Information management behaviour

CIOs = CTOs



Inadequate leadership and management

Inadequate proactive leadership creates a lack of information management (IM) vision, strategy, policy, guiding principles and management systems

Inappropriate business culture ensures

- Information is not valued as a business asset
- Risk aversion means difficult projects are avoided
- Intuition triumphs over facts

No key person drives information management change

- Executives don't provide sufficient support
- Those who understand IM are too low level to be heard
- Good IM practices are not incentivised

Staff lack:

- The ability to do the work
- The understanding of how to put information to work

Bad IM practices ensure poor data quality resulting in

- Avoidable cost
- Burdensome work practices



Justification is difficult

Markets do not demand the management of information as an asset

Provocateurs don't know how to make IM pass the "so what" test

The cost of managing information is unknown. Most CFOs think the cost of managing information is hardware + software + upgrades + maintenance + support + IT staff salaries

The value of information is contextual and difficult to quantify

The benefits of improving the management of information assets are:

- Intangible
- Unknown
- Intertwined with other influences
- Difficult to realise

Business cases are weak and don't create a sense of urgency

- There is rarely a catalyst or "burning platform." Instead poor information asset management is a "death by a thousand cuts"
- Compliance is a good catalyst but is a poor justification
- Information Management is boring



Inappropriate or ineffective instruments

Accounting practices do not value information as an asset; it can't be capitalised and put on the balance sheet

Language is imprecise. A university has four different definitions of the term "student commencement"

The business / IT partnership is ineffective

Executives want a silver bullet and IT is seen as a panacea. Vendors are only too happy to oblige.

Information management tools e.g. metadata, security models etc. are poorly understood

