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Abstract:
In 2008, what was then RMAA conducted its first Technology Survey, on which we reported in a previous issue. At the time, it was recognized that the greatest value to professionals would come from a longitudinal study, enabling ‘flash in the pan’ innovation to be sorted from durable change that has implications for the work and education of RIM professionals. This article reports results from the RIMPA 2010 Technology Survey, which has enabled a longitudinal view of data first gathered in 2008.

Introduction

If a week is a long time in politics, what can be said of two years in information technology? The first RMAA Technology Survey in 2008 took place against a back drop of the Global Financial Crisis (GFC), something that did not augur well for RIM. On the technology front, there was talk of an impending revolution called ‘cloud computing’ in which applications and data would migrate to the Internet and where Software would be delivered as a Service (SaaS). A new paradigm for the Web called Web 2.0 had become well established, bringing with it various forms of social computing that encompassed messaging, user generated content and online community. Implications of Web 2.0 for RIM were beginning to be debated. Wireless had also become well established and powerful, putting us on a trajectory of mobile and ubiquitous computing. How RIM would operate in the new era of mobile computing was also exercising people’s minds, as Apple’s iPhone and iPad became the staples of dinner time conversation. With HTC’s Android smart phone, pundits predicted an end to the reign of Blackberry.
Two years on, it is clear that progress has been uneven in terms of the technology fare first identified in 2008. The cloud revolution and SaaS remain a revolution waiting. If the cloud remains stuck on the horizon, some other new technologies identified in 2008 have moved to the mainstream. Like its predecessor, the 2010 survey, provided rich insight into how technology is shaping the RIM space.

**Participation**

Responses were down from 630 in 2008 to 242 in 2010. We can only speculate about the reasons for this fall. Perhaps many RIM professionals are under greater time pressures than two years ago and found it more difficult to commit the time required to complete the survey. For others, design issues may have played a role. On the positive side, the decision to run with a survey substantially unchanged from 2008 opened up, for the first time, the possibility of longitudinal analysis and interpretation. Indeed, the analysis and interpretation that follows contains some analysis of this kind. However, such an outcome was never going to be achieved without some pain. In addition to a fall off in the response, skip rates increased from 2008. It is conceivable that skip rates also represent a degree of frustration on the part of respondents with the length and/or design of the survey.

It is now three years since the survey and a major re-design of the instrument is planned. In addition to design issues, a range of developments and products that have emerged or risen to prominence since 2008 will need to be included in further iterations. One important change, captured in the 2010 survey, was the arrival of Windows 7. Alas the change from PDAs to smart phones (iPhone and Android) did not make it in, along with MS Office 2010 and Windows Server 2008 (network OS). These and other new products and developments made their appearance only in the ‘Other (please specify)’ option area of the survey, where this was available. To increase relevance and to improve validity and reliability, the authors have attempted to work with free text response data, particularly where analysis served to fill gaps created by a lack of form options or currency. Looking forward, design of the 2012 survey presents as a challenging task, if opportunities for longitudinal analysis with respect to the 2008/10 data, are to be preserved.

By way of explanation of the nature and limitations of the research, it is also particularly important to remember that the percentage of respondents we report as answering a question in a particular way is the percentage of respondents who answered that question, not the percentage of the total number of the survey population. Where the skip rate for a question is high, the percentage of respondents answering a question in a particular way represents a much smaller percentage of the total survey population. In common with the previous analysis, the 2010 analysis also involves no IP number or domain name attribution, leaving unanswered the question of how many host organizations participated in the survey. Consequently, the 2010 survey, like its predecessor, makes no claim to be a reliable comparative guide to organizational technology adoption outcomes.

**Demography**

The population for the 2010 survey once more comprised subscribers to the RMAA Listserv and Forum. We have already noted the extent to which responses were down compared with 2008. The demography of the survey response was similar to 2008. In 2008, data analysis showed that the typical
respondent was female (65.2%) and under the age of 45 (53.6%). The largest cohort was found in the 36-45 year age group (30.3%). In 2010, the gender imbalance between males and females has not significantly changed (females= 65.1%). However, the majority of respondents are 45 or older (56.4%) with the largest cohort comprising the 45-55 year age group (39.1%). As was the case two years ago, the typical survey respondent was Australian hailing from New South Wales (24.1%), Queensland (15.8%) or Victoria (13.3%). The biggest cohort of international respondents was once again regional, hailing from New Zealand (16.6%). Unlike the 2008 survey, no other international responses were recorded.

Distribution by employing industry/sector was similar to the 2008 study, with the majority of respondents (66.56%) employed in Government. By sector, the Local Government cohort grew from 24.4% in 2008 to 31.1% in 2010. State Government (20.7%) and Federal/Commonwealth Government (14.5%) recorded similar response rates to 2008 (Q.2, r=241). The size of program host organizations did not change significantly from 2008, with the largest cohort again comprising organizations with more than 500 users (44.8%). Representation of small organizations with less than 100 users, declined from 19.6% in 2008 to 14.2% in 2010 (Figure 1). In summary, the 2010 response, like its predecessor, was weighted in favor of large government organizations with more than 500 RIM users (44.8%) (Q.3, r=239).

In any non normal distribution of data in terms of key parameters (such as size and sector) the implications of sample bias need to be kept in mind. Like its predecessor, the 2010 survey paints a picture of technology adoption in large, public sector organizations, where Enterprise RIM and appreciation of the need for compliance are well established.

The more things change: Information technology and the desktop

In 2010, HP/Compaq was reported by 41.3% of respondents, displacing Dell at the top of the vendor tree. Dell slipped to second (36.3%) with IBM/Lenovo in third with 8.1% (r=160). The practice of rolling over desktop machines every three years has grown from 31.2% in 2008 (r=308) to 46.9% in 2010 (r=160). Laptop use in place of desktops did not significantly change between 2008 and 2010. The
notion of a Standard Operating Environment (SOE), however, was reported as a procurement driver by 66.7% of respondents, as opposed to 56.5% of respondents in 2008. SOE appears to be firming as a procurement strategy.

Since the last survey, there has been no change to Microsoft dominance on the desktop. According to 2010 data, the MS Office productivity software suite accounts for 88.3% of WPs found on desktops (r=195). If you were looking for a cloud on the MS Office suite horizon, the data disappointed, with only one token reference to Google Docs. Results are consistent with AGIMO’s recent endorsement of Office Open XML and the government bias of the sample, the former likely to add to MS Office dominance going forward.

The situation more generally with open source software adoption appears to have changed little between 2008 (18.9%) and 2010 (16.2%). Web content management and learning systems are the most mentioned applications. Between 2008 and 2010, Windows XP, now legacy and unsupported by Microsoft, declined from 82.7% to 66.7% (r=159) of respondent desktops, with Windows 7 now present on 13.8% of respondent machines. Vista showed improvement over the 2008 data (from 2.2% to 5.0%), but has since moved to legacy along with XP, bringing the troubled Vista story to an end. Compared with 2008, Outlook dominance as the email solution of choice marginally increased from 74.7% of respondents to 81.8%. Relative to 2008, Portable Document Format (PDF) and its archival variant PDF/A, grew in popularity as retention formats, the former increasing from 63.9% in 2008 to 78.1% in 2010. Use of PDF/A as a long term format rose from 7.9% to 16.8% of respondents, pointing to its growing acceptance as an archival standard. Since 2008, PDF appears to have firmed as the retention format of choice.

**EDRMS/ECM Installed Base**

In 2010, 12.8% of respondents (r=196) reported no EDRMS installed in the host organization or the use of manual controls, a result similar to 2008. How has vendor representation changed in terms of aggregate response? What was once Towersoft’s but is now HP’s TRIM maintained its strong position growing from 32.7% in 2008 to 39.3% in 2010, with Objective (7.1%) and RecFind (6.6%) reporting similar results to 2008. New entrants and movers in terms of the 2010 response included OpenText (7.3%) and Dataworks (7.8%). SharePoint did not figure greatly in the sample response, being nominated by only (4.1%) of respondents. Overall, in this enterprise market, enterprise application vendors appear to be holding their ground for the time being in the ERDMS/ECM marketplace.

Questions from the 2008 survey aimed at assessing the functional capabilities of these systems (e.g. document management, records management, workflow, electronic records management) were repeated in 2010. The relatively modest attribution of product against web content and knowledge management first observed in 2008, features once again in the 2010 data. Access to longitudinal data for the first time in 2011, has enabled the identification of some trends. Figure 2 is a bar graph representation showing ECM applications in host organizations:
Comparing the 2008 and 2010 data for this question, across each of these functions and types, organizations appear to be making greater use of IM/ECM. For example, use of these systems in email management grew from 57.4% to 66.7% of respondents. Similar growth was recorded for electronic documents and records, information security, audit logging, compliance and workflow. As measured by respondent attribution of use, host organizations appear to be deploying more of the functionality that systems are delivering. Consistent with this inference, data elsewhere describes the percentage of respondents who claim to have fully implemented the functionality of their ECM/EDRMS systems – rising from 20.9% in 2008 to 29.1% in 2010. A blot on the copy book can be seen in the disappointingly low utilization of web content management, where the data shows no progress between 2008 (16.8%) and 2010 (16.7%).

**Procurement and benefits realization**

If RIMers are working harder to maximize the benefits of enterprise EDRMS/ECM, have they become more influential in technology procurement? The data shows that self perception as a stakeholder in technology procurement decision making declined between 2008 (48.8%) and 2010 (36.8%). In terms of business benefits, in a sample biased towards large government organizations, it comes as no surprise that compliance continues to rate as the most important factor in the adoption of RIM technology (Q. 23) – up from 51% in 2008 to 62% in 2010. Compliance as a driver of enterprise RIM looms large in benefits realization as well, growing from 37.3% of respondents in 2008, to 51.6% in 2010 (Figure 3).
The data show an upward trend in perception by respondents of benefits realized. **Respondent perception of benefit has increased across most benefit types, with strong gains in compliance, efficiency, discovery and knowledge re-use and capture.** Of course, this is the RIMer perception of benefit and provides no guidance on the views of other stakeholders within host organizations.

If the perception of derived business benefit has grown healthier since 2008, barriers to achieving benefit have remained consistent, with ‘Changing existing work practices’ (66.1%, r=168) and ‘Too many information silos’ (47.6%) weighing in with very similar figures to 2008. Cost and difficulty in justifying ROI rose slightly as a perceived impediment from 26.5% in 2008 to 33.3% in 2010. Alas, comparison of data on salaries showed that in an increasingly challenging work environment, complexity does not equate with increasing recognition of value - respondents believe that competencies have increased, but not salaries (from 23.3% in 2008 to 28.6% in 2010).

**Governance: still a shared responsibility?**

Who is responsible, in a corporate sense, for records management and for related functions and services in survey organizations?⁹ We noted in our previous article based on 2008 data that RIM was widely seen as a shared responsibility. There was a broadly similar result in 2010, but there was also some evidence of possible shift. In relation to responsibility for records management functions (Q32, r=170), the two combinations “Both records management and information technology departments” (29.4%) and “Business units, records managers, information managers and IT departments” (31.8%) are still dominant, but the order is reversed and both are down by a small margin. The next biggest option —
“Records / Document / Information Managers only” — increased from 15.4% to 21.2%. In relation to enterprise content management functions (ECM) (Q33, r=164), the same two combinations came out on top, again with the order also reversed. The top option “Both records management and information technology departments” grew from 25.2% to 31.7%.

At face value, these results suggest that records management is less a shared responsibility than it was in 2008 and that ECM is more a shared responsibility. A difficulty in interpreting these results is definitional uncertainty. We do not know what our respondents’ common understanding of ECM is nor what the relationship between these two concepts is. Do they stand side by side? Or is records management merely a small subset of ECM, as the Association for Information and Image Management tells us? Nor do we know whether ECM is synonymous with other broad concepts like information management in a wide cross-section of respondents’ organizations.

The survey did not attempt to define records management (which is understandable) or ECM (which is less so), to help respondents to understand their intended scope for the purposes of the survey. Indeed the survey included two questions which asked “Which of the following would you consider to be records management (RM) or enterprise content management (ECM) functions?” respectively. Respondents chose from the same list of eleven functions in relation to RM and ECM. Naturally the percentage of positive responses for each function differed considerably between RM and ECM. The fact that all the functions had significant positive response rates in both questions — indeed “Capture of emails” was ranked third in both questions — suggests that there is not a clear common understanding in our community of the difference in the scope of RM and ECM.

**Communication and Messaging**

Earlier we noted Outlook’s dominance of corporate email systems. The 2008 survey noted a majority of host organizations limiting mailbox size (63.6%) as a response to the problem of escalating storage costs. The 2010 survey records a similar, albeit slightly smaller majority (59.4%) (Q. 36, r= 170). Setting aside the long standing argument about the suitability of ECM & EDRMS as the solution of best fit for email capture into the corporate store, utilization of these solutions has grown from 35.7% of respondents in 2008 to 46.2 % in 2010 (Q. 42, r=169).

This result is tempered by the ‘Other’ responses to this question, with three respondents noting that capture/profiling into an EDRMS is the policy, but many users do not follow it. Similarly, the number of respondents using a Records Management application to store email rose from (19.8% to 24.9%), though the difference between this and the capture/profiling option is not clear. The non-management options — letting users keep all messages in the mail file and letting them create personal archive files — were commensurately down (31.5% to 24.3% and 30.6% to 26.6% respectively). This suggests that more of our respondents’ organizations are conscious of the risks of these options and organizations are working to achieve greater control of email.

Coincidentally, acceptance and utilization of email archiving has grown across all measures. Twenty one per cent (21.0%) of respondents (Q,42, r= 169) reported working in organizations that use archiving applications (up from 16.4% in 2008). The number of respondents reporting no email archiving in use in
the host organizations declined from 57.5% in 2008 to 43.7% in 2010 (Q.43, r=167). Has email archiving come of age? In a 2010 review of enterprise content management, industry analysts Gartner, cite improved email application performance, reduced storage costs, improved email backup and recovery, compliance and e-discovery as important business drivers. Business benefit is rated as high. The vendor line up in this survey encompasses product such as Zantaz, Symantec Enterprise Vault, EMC Email Extender, GFI Archiver and Quest Archive Manager. New entrants include Aftermail and Mimosa Nearpoint. Symantec’s Enterprise Vault is the most popular solution encompassing 14.4% of respondents, followed by Quest Archive Manager (4.8%). The number of respondents who were unsure or did not know whether the host organization had an email archiving solution was consistent with 2008 and once again disappointingly high (31.9%). Are some RIMers displaying the silo mentality that they complain so loudly about when encountered elsewhere in organizations? In the absence of email archiving, the capability of searching Outlook (.pst) email archives across the network may be required for business and compliance reasons. Between 2008 and 2010, this capability grew from 13.1% of respondents to 18.7% (Q.46, r=166).

The growth in use of this range of solutions for capturing and managing email as records — profiling email into an EDRMS, using a Records Management application to store email and email archiving — may well reflect a number of organizations having decided on their approach since the 2008 survey. The number of respondents “Currently evaluating applications to manage email history” (Q42, r=169) fell from 16.4% in 2008 to 4.7% in 2010.

In our review of the 2008 data on Instant Messaging (IM) we observed that IM “tends to be seen as suitable for personal, but not business communications, with many employers regarding it as a threat to productivity.” This was borne out in the number of respondents whose organizations did not permit the use of instant messaging programs and enforce this as policy (36.5%). The 2010 data show IM no closer to the mainstream with around the same percentage of respondents (36.0%) (Q.55, r=164) for this item reporting organizations not allowing use and enforcing this policy. As evidence perhaps that host organizations are more prepared to embrace IM bred for business, the percentage of respondents reporting use of ‘secure’ ‘internal’ IM in the form of products such as Microsoft LCS, Lotus SameTime or GroupWise Messenger grew from 17.2% in 2008 to 25.3% in 2010 (Q.56, r=162).

With growing concern about computer security, it would be a surprise if organizational attitudes to external Webmail (Gmail, Hotmail, Yahoo, MSN) showed any sign of moderation. And the data yielded no surprises with the percentage of respondents reporting systems restrictions limiting access in the workplace growing from 35.6% to 39.6% (Q.57, r=164). But these technologies are old hat anyway. More relevant in 2010 would be information about social networking services like Facebook, Myspace and Twitter. Use of these services has raised similar issues with employers, including productivity implications arising from time wasting.

Much more important for RIM than the personal use of these services by employees is their use by organizations, along with blogs on their own websites, for communicating with customers and stakeholders as part of their mainstream business. And where you interact with your customers and stakeholders, there are recordkeeping requirements and RIM implications. Unfortunately the survey
gives us no insight into trends in this area. Clearly this is an area for improvement in future iterations of the survey.

**New technology**

Database archiving appears to have gained ground since 2008, with the percentage of respondents reporting no database archiving declining from 55.4% to 44.2% (Q44, r= 163). However, little certainty can be attached to findings here with 43.6% of respondents admitting to being unsure, up from 33.8% in 2008. EMC is the only significant vendor reported in this market accounting for 6.1% of respondents.

The use of RFID for file and asset tracking grew from very small numbers in 2008, to 9.1% of respondents in 2010 (Q.53, r= 164). Q54 explored respondent perception of technology and its potential for utilization in the RIM program. According to the 2010 data, RFID, Cloud computing, EDRMS/ECM and Sharepoint are the technologies most likely to be undergoing analysis/assessment for potential utilization in the RIM program (Q54, r=54). However, there is many a slip between the cup and the lip as they say, and feasibility assessment is no reliable guide to technology adoption.

Cloud computing is a case in point. The 2010 data contain remarkably slim evidence of adoption, with only one respondent citing organizational use for data protection and backup and one other reporting evaluation in conjunction with tablet devices – presumably a reference to the iPad. According to industry analysts Gartner,¹⁴ five important adoption inhibitors (risks) have undermined enthusiasm for the cloud. Respectively, these are:

1. Data location risk – The risk pertaining to where records are being stored, something often not transparent in hosting arrangements;
2. Data and code portability risk - A full application system offered as a cloud service or software as a service (SaaS), can be a tricky place to retrieve code and data, if required;
3. Data loss risk - The risk that a SaaS provider might lose data or records;
4. Data security (privacy) risk – The risk pertaining to operation over the Internet and out of sight, where security and privacy are clear risks; and
5. Vendor viability risk – The risk of vendor instability. For example, in April 2011, Techworld reported Iron Mountain’s decision to close its cloud based storage services. According to Gartner, Iron Mountain’s announcement made it the “third public cloud infrastructure as a service (IaaS) provider to abandon the market over the past year.”¹⁵

In an enterprise context, risk must be carefully considered, and the ‘internal’ cloud looks a much safer prospect for organizations going forward.

The 2010 survey showed modest increases in the availability of wireless networking in respondent organizations (Q77, r=158) (Figure 4). Wireless networking was available in the entire office for 13.9% of respondents (10.3% in 2008) and in selected areas for 25.3% of respondents (24.7% in 2008); while the organizations offering no wireless networking fell from 32.7% in 2008 to 27.8% in 2010. Confusingly, the organizations offering wireless networking away from the office fell from 9.9% in 2008 to 7.6% in 2010! Individually these changes might be regarded as not statistically significant, but together they seem to
indicate a general upward trend. The availability of wireless connectivity for visitors in conference rooms (Q78, r=159) grew from 20.3% in 2008 to 27% in 2010.

![Figure 4- Do you offer wireless networking in your organisation?](image)

On the face of it, these small, perhaps even equivocal, changes are surprising. Since the 2008 survey we have seen the rise of two successive types of wireless devices: firstly Netbooks and then the new generation of tablet computers kicked off by the release of Apple’s iPad in 2010. Tablets, in particular, have been touted as business, as well as consumer, devices. Perhaps it is too early to expect to see an impact from the penetration of these devices on the availability of wireless networking in our respondents’ organizations. In any case, we need data about the deployment of these devices, if we want to identify the relationship between them and growth in wireless networking. Wireless computing has the potential to change profoundly the way organizations function. Despite the limited evidence available from the survey so far, this is truly an area to watch.

The survey had seven questions about PDAs. We noted in our previous article that this type of device was dominated by smart phones.16 Two years on, talking about PDAs is even more of an anachronism. The maturing of tablet devices, notably the release of Apple’s iPad 2 and a growing range of Android-based competitors, and their growing use as business devices, presents as another hole in the survey.

Last time we noted that penetration of these devices in respondent organizations remained limited. That appears less the case now, with 11–25% of people using them in 20% of respondent organizations (up from 11.3%), and 26–50% of people using them in 9% of respondents’ organizations (up from 4.4%).
The dominance of BlackBerry handheld devices continued (Q80, up from 50.8% to 57.2%) but it would have been interesting if newer products, such as iPhones, Android smartphones and tablets, had been available as options.

From the RIM perspective, the most interesting question about PDAs was Q86 (Do the PDA’s integrate with the organization’s DM / RM / EDRMS system?). While biased towards a certain approach, this question at least provides some indication of the extent to which business conducted by employees using this technology can be captured into the corporate record. There is little change from the 2008 survey (“Yes” up from 8.1% to 10.3%). A cause for uncertainty is the likelihood that many of these devices would be connected to corporate email servers which, in turn, may be linked to records management systems. So it may be possible to capture records of messages sent to and from a much larger proportion of these devices.

Of more concern is that 28.1% responded “Don’t know / Unsure / NA” — plus the 39.7% of the survey population who skipped the question. This suggests that, for many of us, the RIM implications of smart devices are not yet on our radar.

One might have expected to see growth in the use of corporate or enterprise portals among respondents’ organizations (Q92: What portal product do you use?). The survey shows little change, with a slight fall in the “None” response (21.7% to 17.1%) and the continued dominance of Microsoft Sharepoint (up from 30.4% to 34.9%). Of interest from the RIM perspective would be the extent to which RM services are available to users working within portal environments, for example, through RM products that integrate with portal systems, like Australia’s RecordPoint.

**Conclusion**

The 2010 survey provided the first opportunity for a longitudinal review of data first gathered in 2008. Subject to its limitations, survey data showed that perception of benefit realization from RIM and ECM in respondent host organizations has grown since 2008. Coincidentally, as measured by respondent attribution of use, host organizations are deploying more of the functionality that systems deliver. Both are positive indicators for the future of the RIM program. Elsewhere the data are more sobering and suggest that the ‘tectonic plates’ of records, documents, data and information may be shifting in ways that redefine the RIM program and pose challenges to RIMers who do not recognize these changes.

For example, the data show the growing importance of technologies currently outside the RIM space that are significant in RIM terms. Deployment of email archiving is up and the first evidence of database archiving adoption is also coming through. The former elevates to centre stage the comprehensive capturing of information artifacts that are evidence of communications and messaging behavior. In evidential terms, what matters is the email document consisting of the metadata, message text, and attachments. Database archiving shifts the locus of concern to the management of data, with seldom used data in information lifecycle management terms, held in XML format. The data also show that only one in ten respondents works in an organization that can claim some level of integration of smartphone technology (Q.86) into enterprise EDRMS/ECM systems. Mobile computing is mostly conducted outside the control of enterprise RIM.
In summary, as it was in 2008 and 2010, communications and information technology is working to create new challenges and tools for the enterprise RIM program. As the landscape becomes more complex and rich in terms of the technology tool set, opportunities are created for adaptive RIM professionals who are committed to up skilling, lifelong learning and are prepared to see the program holistically. This is the main lesson to be learned from the mass of data gathered over two years of survey work to date. In Making Records Management Fit for Purpose, Paula Smith sums it up:

“The line between records, information, data, and knowledge is blurring in ever-increasing ways. The convergence of technologies, the advances, the ways in which we are using the technologies before us mean that we as records and information management (RIM) professionals cannot see ourselves and our discipline as divorced from the paradigm in which we operate.”17

As well as pointing to the need to work more collaboratively and holistically, to bridge the service gap between records, documents and data, the data also point to the risks of excessive reliance upon compliance as a business driver and the ‘one tool to rule them all’ mindset. Compliance was identified in both 2008 and 2010 as the single most important driver of RIM adoption, growing in importance as measured by the percentage response. Perception of measured Return on Investment (ROI) as a barrier to the expansion of RIM (Q.27) also grew over the same period from 26.5% of respondents in 2008 to 33.1% in 2010. Being able to value information assets and demonstrate their relationship with the real business of organizations using financial and non-financial metrics has never been more important, but seems neglected, according to the data. For most RIM program managers, ROI will be a much more effective justification than compliance.

‘One tool to rule them all’, is short hand for over investment in enterprise ECM/EDRMS business solutions to the exclusion of other, potentially more efficient solutions. Even where ECM/EDRMS is the most efficient solution to a RIM problem, thoughtful approaches to planning and implementation are required. We are told in RIM 101 that successful ECM/EDRMS deployment requires executive sponsorship, support across the organization and good change management. If anyone of these factors is missing, or if the benefits of RIM have been oversold, ECM/EDRMS may find it has few enthusiastic supporters outside its immediate sponsor community. Exploring new business opportunities for the RIM program is therefore both a source of rejuvenation and an essential risk management strategy. The 2008 and 2010 data offer some great insights into what kinds of new technologies and knowledge bases some of our more innovative colleagues are exploring. Amid the many references to ECM, EDRMS and WCM, we find business intelligence and collaboration, data mining, enterprise resource planning, customer relationships management, information life cycle management, data archiving with XML- to name a few. The scope of our work and interest as RIM practitioners must move to encompass them all.

ENDNOTES:


Reckoned by RIMPA management to involve a survey population of 950 (N=950).

r= 630 (2008); r=242(2010)

This figure does not include respondents who answered ‘Other’ (9.7%). Inspection showed that almost all of these responses were MS as well, raising the overall figure to 98% of surveyed desktops.


Software that provides website authoring, collaboration, and administration tools designed to allow users with little knowledge of web programming languages or markup languages to create and manage website content with relative ease. (Wikipedia, n.d.)


AIIM. “What is Enterprise Content Management (ECM)?” Retrieved 3 July 2011 from [http://www.aiim.org/What‐is‐ECM‐Enterprise‐Content‐Management.aspx](http://www.aiim.org/What‐is‐ECM‐Enterprise‐Content‐Management.aspx)


