ANNEX 3: E-DOMEC COMPOSITE INDICATOR 2012

1. INTRODUCTION

The Composite Indicator, which shows the level of correct implementation of e-Domec policy by the Commission services, has been drawn up for the fourth consecutive year by SGB2, with the collaboration of all DMOs.

The SG launched the interactive policy-making (IPM) questionnaire in October 2012, inviting all the DGs, Services and Executive Agencies (this note calls them all "DGs" for brevity) to assess the processes, procedures and mechanisms in place to manage their documents and files according to e-Domec rules. The questionnaire focuses on eight key areas: organisation, training, registration, filing, preservation, appraisal, sensitive information and retrieval of documents.

The answers obtained from this self-assessment exercise have been complemented with statistical data from Ares. In general the data confirms the answers given by DGs but on occasion the data reveals a disparity.

The 2012 composite indicator (Commission e-Domec implementation score) shows a **compliance rate of 89%** for the Commission and Executive Agencies as a whole, **2 percentage points higher than last year**.

2. GLOBAL RESULTS

In total, 49 replies to the Composite Indicator 2012 questionnaire were received.

37 DGs improved their overall score, 3 showed a lower score, and 9 achieved the same score as last year. 5 DGs achieved a 100% score. The main results of each section are given below, with the overall percentage for this year compared with the previous year, followed by additional comment.

Organisation 94% (94%)

➢ Average figure remains high at 94%. Where DGs have a lower than average score, this is linked to having vacant DMO / deputy DMO posts and/or a reduction in staff in DMO/CAD's resources, in some cases due to a reorganisation.

➢ Hierarchical support varies. Some DMOs report that they need more active support from their senior and middle management, and/or that, while management globally supports e-Domec policies, it is more reluctant to lead by example or to be directly involved in their implementation.

Training 90% (91%)

➢ Slightly lower average than in 2011.

➢ Most DGs implement the different types of training actions suggested in the questionnaire (use of intranet, induction programmes, awareness raising campaigns, tailored trainings according to roles…).

➢ Staff mobility makes it more difficult to guarantee appropriate training for all staff closely involved in document management. In a few DGs, some CAD staff still has to follow the prescribed trainings.

Registration 88% (87%)

➢ Slightly higher average than last year.

➢ Some DGs have developed well-organized monitoring and quality control systems (either systematic or by sampling).

Filing **91%** *(88%)*

➢ Significantly higher average than in 2011.

➢ Statistics drawn from Ares show contrasting results: no clear trend as regards unfiled documents; less empty files and files with no CRL category than in 2011; but more inactive files (last document filed more than one year ago).

Storage and preservation **84%** *(79%)*

➢ Significantly higher average than in 2011.

➢ Nearly all DGs have finalised their archive schedule.

➢ Some DGs still have insufficient storage space or storage conditions not compliant with preservation requirements. This point, already mentioned last year, involves DGs' logistics and building management and should therefore be a point of attention and liaison for the management, OIB/OIL and the building superintendents.

Appraisal and transfer **87%** *(85%)*

➢ Higher average than in 2011, as expected following the completion of the archive schedules.

➢ Higher scores for DGs where the process is centralized or under close supervision of the DMO.

➢ For young DGs, which have only active files, this area of document management is not yet applicable.

Sensitive and personal data **86%** *(80%)*

➢ Significantly higher average than in 2011, but a few DGs have low scores.

➢ Some DMO comment that the rules are not easy to understand, and/or that they do not have access to certain sensitive data themselves and therefore cannot apply any controls.

➢ Some DGs indicate that they do not deal with this type of document and therefore this area is not applicable to them.

Access and retrieval **86%** *(85%)*

➢ Slightly higher average than in 2011.

➢ There are still some negative comments on the Ares search engine, although search functionalities have been improved in the 2012 releases of Ares/Nomcom.

3. **FOLLOW UP**

All DGs will receive an individual sheet containing their detailed results in the form of descriptive and comparative graphs, as well as summary information on their current situation and in comparison with previous years and recommendations, where appropriate, for improvement.

This exercise will be repeated in 2013 to continue tracking progress with regards to e-Domec implementation.

Annexes

(1) Table: Composite Indicator 2012 – Compliance (%) of e-Domec rules by DGs and EAs

(2) Table: Ares statistical data for 2012 and comparative totals