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Overview of ERMS Applications in Turkey

Electronic Records Management Systems (ERMS) are supported by legal and administrative regulations in Turkey.

- Electronic Signature Law
- “e-Correspondence” initiative
Turksat is one of the leading information and communications companies in Turkey.

Turksat operates in 3 business fields:
1- Satellite
2- Cable TV infrastructure and digital TV platform
3- IT Solutions and Services (e.g. e-Gov Gateway)

Head Quarter: Ankara / Turkey
Local offices: 21 Provinces of Turkey
Number of Employees: 864
Sales: ~ $500 M
ERMS Implementations by Türksat

- Ankara University
- Türksat (as an inner customer)
- Undersecretariat of Treasury
- General Directorate of Forestry
- Ministry of Labor and Social Security
- Ministry of Interior
- Turkish Post (PTT)
- Turkish Disaster and Emergency Management
- Turkish Coastal Safety
In the scope of this study, 3 ERMS implementations of TURKSAT are selected. These are:

- ERMS for Ankara University (a university)
- ERMS for Turksat itself (a company)
- ERMS for Undersecretariat of Treasury (a government institution)
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IMPLEMENTATIONS AND EFFECTIVE PARAMETERS

This study examines the differences between ERMS implementations through effective parameters.

These parameters are listed below:

1- Organizational structure
2- Records intensity and capacity
3- Integration requirements and points
4- Metadata schemas to be used
PARAMETER 1: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Organizational Structure effects the ERMS implementantation in 2 ways:

1- The establishment of the mechanism for responding incoming /outgoing records INRES (i.e. records from /to other institutions, companies and citizens)

2- The mechanism for constructing the signature (approval) route or order.
INCOMING RECORD/DOCUMENT REGISTRY (INRES) MODELS

SINGLE INRES MODEL

Central INRES

Head Quarter

MULTI INRES MODEL

Central INRES

Head Quarter
SIGNATURE / APPROVAL ROUTE MODELS

**STATIC (PREDEFINED) SIGNATURE ROUTE**
- Director
  - Signs: e-Sign
- Manager
  - Initials: e-Sign
- Employee B
  - Initials: e-Sign
- Employee A
  - Initials: e-Sign

**DYNAMIC SIGNATURE ROUTE**
- General Manager
- Director
- Manager
- Employee B
- Employee C
- Employee A
  - Initials: e-Sign

---

*Note: The diagrams illustrate the flow of signature approval routes.*
COMPARISON OF ORG. STRUCTURE — ANKARA UNIVERSITY

Under the Presidency of Ankara University, 3 Vice Presidents operates 5 councils, 14 Faculties, 13 Institutions, 9 Vocational Training Schools, 2 Research Hospitals, 36 Research Centers and 8 central directorships.

- Physically distant campuses and locations (one of the biggest universities in Turkey)
- There exists a central incoming records registry service (INRES) within the Presidency and discrete INRES within each location
- **ERMS needs to be adjusted to multi INRES structure**

Since, Ankara University has academic units involved in the official records and forms management

- Signature and/or approval routes are changeable for each record/document
- **ERMS needs to be flexible for defining dynamic approval routes**
COMPARISON OF ORG. STRUCTURE – TURKSAT

Under the Presidency of Turksat, 5 Vice Presidents operates 3 different business units. There are 24 directorships and 21 locations in provinces of Turkey.

- Each business unit has its own campus in Ankara, 3 in total.
- A central incoming records registry service (INRES) within the Head Quarter and discrete INRES within each campus and province location.

- **ERMS needs to be adjusted to multi INRES structure**

Since Turksat is a state-owned company, its signature and/or approval route procedures have similarities with government institutions.

- But the company can be represented with at least 2 signatures for outgoing records/documents.
- Frequent business trips of the executives requires a well established proxy signature/approval route mechanism
- **ERMS needs to be flexible for defining dynamic approval routes**
Undersecretariat is the head of Turkish Treasury. The institution operates under the supervision of 3 assistant undersecretariat, with 8 general directorates.

- Treasury operates only in its central campus in Ankara, without any other distant locations.
- A central incoming records registry service (INRES) within the Head Quarter
- **ERMS needs to be adjusted to single INRES structure**

Treasury is a typical governmental institution, which needs to process the records/documents according to legal regulations.

- Well defined and rarely changeable signature and/or approval routes.
- **ERMS needs to be flexible for defining static and predefined signature/approval routes**
RECORDS INTENSITY OF THE INSTITUTION

- Records intensity of studied implementations is different because of (i) the size of the institution, (ii) the number of users, (iii) the number of correspondent institutions etc.
- Records intensity of the institution plays an important role in determining the hardware infrastructure.
- ERMS needs to be scaleable in terms of processing power and storage capacity.

### Yearly Numbers (on average)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ankara Univ.</th>
<th>Turksat</th>
<th>Undersecretariat of Treasury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incoming Rec.</td>
<td>505,000</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing Rec.</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>83,400</td>
<td>103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Size of each Record</td>
<td>4 MB</td>
<td>4 MB</td>
<td>4 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Storage Capacity (Yearly)</td>
<td>4.000 GB</td>
<td>333 GB</td>
<td>412 GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTEGRATION REQUIREMENTS AND POINTS

Within the scope of this study, the following integration requirements and points for the ERMS implementations are selected:

1. Integration with an existing human resource software
2. Single Sign On (SSO) integration
3. e-Signature integration
4. Integration with Turkish State Organization Database (SOD)
**HR Software Integration — Comparison**

- If the customer uses an HR Software, in terms of efficiency and maintainability ERMS should integrate with the software at either service or database level.
- This way, the users, their roles, organisational hierarchy, authorization can be managed through the HR Software.
- If there is no HR Software used in the customer, ERMS should provide interfaces for management of the users.
- **ERMS needs to be flexible to either integrate with HR softwares or provide use interfaces**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ankara Unv.</th>
<th>Türksat A.Ş.</th>
<th>Treasury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No HR integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Users are managed via ERMS interfaces</td>
<td>• No HR integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Users are managed via ERMS interfaces</td>
<td>• HR Software Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Database level integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SINGLE SİNG ON (SSO) INTEGRATION – COMPARISON

• In the case when SSO is integrated with ERMS, the users can access the ERMS with their domain usernames and passwords.

• ERMS needs to be flexible to either integrate with LDAP servers provide authentication and authorization mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ankara Unv.</th>
<th>Türksat A.Ş.</th>
<th>Treasury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No LDAP integration during test and training phase</td>
<td>• LDAP integration</td>
<td>• LDAP integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LDAP will be used during production phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electronic Signature Integration – Comparison**

- The legality of the records/documents is provided with the electronic signature.
- Legaly, all executives must use e-Signature. But paraph (or initials) of subordinates does not necessarily require e-Signature.
- Customers can procure e-Signature API which is provided by different vendors (free-market)
- **ERMS needs to be flexible to manage different choices of e-Signature usage models and API of the customers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ankara Unv.</th>
<th>Türksat A.Ş.</th>
<th>Treasury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • No e-Signature for the paraph(intials)  
• e-Signature API of the state | • E-Signature for all users regardless of executives or subordinates  
• E-Signature API of the state | • E-Signature for all users regardless of executives or subordinates  
• E-Signature API of a private company |
**State Organization Database Integration – Comparison**

- State Organization Database (SOD) is the system in which the governmental institutions and attached companies are managed in an hierarchical way.
- This system eases correspondence problems especially in inter-institutional record/document sending.
- ERMS needs to be flexible to integrate with SOD and to provide user interfaces for manual interferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ankara Unv.</th>
<th>Türksat</th>
<th>Treasury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Full SOD integration  
• Interfaces required for manual recording of correspondences which are not in SOD | • Full SOD integration | • Full SOD integration |
Metadata schemas used for ERMS are:

- Turkish e-Correspondance Initiative Schema
- TS 13298 Schema
- Dublin Core Standarts

- The Turksat ERMS, supports the first two schemas fully (which are obligatory) and the third partially.

- The software can be personalized according to the determined metadata type by the system managers.
CONCLUSION

• Different attributes of organizations require fundamental modifications within the Electronic Records/Document Management Systems.

• Examining the effective parameters within this study showed us that, ERMS needs to be flexible to:
  - adjusted to multi and single INRES structure
  - define dynamic and static (predefines) approval routes
  - scale up/down processing power and storage capacity
  - integrate with HR softwares and provide user interfaces for user management
  - integrate with LDAP servers or should provide authentication and authorization mechanisms
  - manage different choices of e-Signature usage models and API of the customers.
  - integrate with databases like central state organization (SOD)
CONCLUSION

• Electronic Records/Document Management Systems are becoming an essential part of the e-State infrastructure.

• ERMS needs to be modified greatly for each institution or customer.

• Todays well developed ERP systems can be good model for ERMS, interms of parametric adjustment rather than custom software development.
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