



## BUYER CASE STUDY

### A U.S. Bank Holding Company Employs ZL Technologies' Unified Archive for Compliant Archiving, Supervision, eDiscovery, and Mailbox Management

Vivian Tero

#### IDC OPINION

The *IDC 2009 Corporate eDiscovery Survey* concludes that email found in distributed endpoints, messaging servers and gateways, and file shares remains among the top 10 sources of litigation event collections. Having sound retention and legal hold practices are a corporate litigant's critical lines of defense during such events. Email archiving solutions are critical to enforcing these retention and legal hold protocols. Corporations that are looking to acquire and deploy email archiving solutions are advised to consider the following:

- ☒ Understand the gaps between the current organizational, process, and technology capabilities across key internal stakeholders and the desired states so that these are incorporated in the development, change management, deployment, and production phases of the project.
- ☒ Close collaboration between IT and legal from inception through development, deployment, content migration, and production is critical. Organizations must plan for organizational and technology transitions.
- ☒ From a technology standpoint, be very clear early on the desired technology architecture. Understand the implications and potential trade-offs on application performance, search and indexing, and scale-out strategy. Be cognizant of the long-term total costs to the organization instead of looking merely at the initial capital acquisition costs. Be able to identify opportunities for leverage across multiple objectives. In this case study, the buyer initially started out with mailbox management and supervision but had a long-term plans to address compliant retention and eDiscovery. These long-term objectives impact the technology strategy as well as the buyer's future compliance and eDiscovery operations.

## IN THIS BUYER CASE STUDY

This IDC Buyer Case Study highlights the selection process and implementation of ZL Technologies' Unified Archive to support the compliance archiving, supervision, eDiscovery, and mailbox management initiatives of "Bank Holding Company" (name withheld upon request).

## SITUATION OVERVIEW

---

### Organization Overview

"Bank Holding Company" provides a broad range of banking, wealth management, asset management, and corporate and investment banking products across the United States, Canada, and Latin America.

Bank Holding Company had over 120,000 users and more than 173,000 mailboxes, of which 35,000 had to be migrated from Domino into Exchange. The organization had been using a legacy archiving and supervision solution to support the business units that had SEC Rule 17a-4 and NASD 3010/3110 obligations.

### Challenges and Solution

Several factors contributed to the decision to upgrade Bank Holding Company's legacy email archiving solution:

- ☒ The 2006 amendments to the FRCP for eDiscovery compelled Bank Holding Company to expand its retention and compliant archiving practices to the broader organization. The Bank had an existing email archiving solution for the business units that had to comply with SEC/FINRA rules 17a-3/17a-4. However, the incumbent solution provided no mailbox management support. As email volumes continued to grow aggressively, Bank Holding Company wanted to efficiently manage storage costs and meet its compliant archiving and eDiscovery requirements, without having to impose limits on individual mailbox sizes.
- ☒ eDiscovery search and retrieval was increasingly becoming an operational issue. The organization's eDiscovery team had to conduct searches across individual mailboxes, messaging archives, and backup tapes. With this approach, the search and export of 1.5 million messages took six to eight weeks to complete. Bank Holding Company was looking for a more efficient solution.

### ZL Technologies' Unified Archive Solution

Bank Holding Company wanted a solution that could address its compliant message archiving, eDiscovery, supervision, and mailbox management projects. It evaluated the on-premise email archiving solutions from the following vendors: Symantec, Autonomy (ZANTAZ), CA, IBM, EMC, Unify (AXS-One), and ZL Technologies.

Bank Holding Company conducted an onsite evaluation on the feature sets it required and employed a third-party organization to certify the search and retrieval performance of the email archiving applications in the short list. After a thorough and complex evaluation process, Bank Holding Company eventually decided upon ZL Technologies. The Bank evaluated the email archiving products and eventually selected the ZL Technologies Unified Archive solution based on the following legal and technology requirements:

- ☒ **Integrated workflows and technical support for compliant archiving and retention, supervision, mailbox management, and eDiscovery.** This included the ability to provide full audit trail on activities related to retention, ingestion, index, search and retrieval, and export of data within the archives. The Bank assigned a higher weighting on the solution that was able to provide this integrated offering relative to solutions that required integration with several third-party applications.
- ☒ **Legal hold case management and fast search and retrieval.** Bank Holding Company utilized a third-party certification firm to assess and validate search and retrieval performance and data culling efficiency:
  - ☐ Bank Holding Company wanted a solution that could support multiple search folders for each custodian, search across the journal and archive database, and provide both static and recurring search scenarios.
  - ☐ The Bank had some challenges in searching and reconciling user aliases with the incumbent email archiving and backup tape solutions. It was important for the incoming email archiving solution to support a more efficient and precise alias reconciliation and search process.
  - ☐ Investigations and eDiscovery searches are currently provided by a dedicated eDiscovery operations team within the IT organization. This group serviced the requests of the Bank's legal and compliance teams. Self-service capabilities for compliant retention, investigations, and eDiscovery (search, analysis, and culling) were a strategic direction. The Bank assigned a higher weighting on solutions that would provide these features from a single product relative to solutions that required the integration with several third-party applications.
- ☒ **Support for both Domino and Exchange environments.** The Bank had grown out of several mergers resulting in a heterogeneous messaging environment. For compliant retention and eDiscovery purposes, the Bank wanted a solution that would allow it to archive from Domino and restore onto Exchange yet still meet the legal chain of custody and auditing requirements.

- ☒ **Support for virtualization and Oracle databases.** This support was key to the general IT strategic direction of Bank Holding Company:
  - ❑ With the exception of the databases, everything was going to be virtualized in the Bank's datacenters. Virtualization is key to Bank Holding Company's strategy for scaling up its operations (including the archives) without compromising the messaging applications performance as well as the search and indexing performance.
  - ❑ The Bank also preferred Oracle databases over MS SQL to support its scale-out and application performance requirements. The Bank's IT organization wanted the index and message objects to be managed under one database instead of the database plus flat file combination. The Bank's IT organization felt that having a singular database (for both index and content) would mitigate potential database and index corruption and rebuild issues.
  - ❑ During the reference customer interviews, database and index rebuilds were noted as the source of instability among several solutions in the short list. The Bank took pains to evaluate these features among the vendors in the final short list.
- ☒ **Vendor flexibility and support.** Vendor flexibility and support were also important criteria for the Bank. Although the project initially started out as a mailbox management project, the records management and legal teams were requesting features specific to their compliance reporting and auditing obligations. The Bank was leery of getting tied down to a vendor's software development life cycle and assigned higher weightings to vendors that were quickly able to respond to these requests. The ability to support Domino archiving and restore to Exchange (while still maintaining legal chain of custody requirements) was one such request. According to Bank Holding Company, ZL was quickly able to respond to these requirements as the vendor owned the code to the core technologies. This capability eventually became a key feature in subsequent ZL Unified Archive releases.
- ☒ **Strong customer references.** The Bank interviewed three to four customer references for each of the top 2 vendors in the short list. The Bank assigned a higher weighting for solutions that had the highest customer satisfaction. Bank Holding Company noted that reference customers highlighted search and retrieval performance and database rebuilds as primary issues that drove them to eventually decide on the ZL Unified Archive.

---

## Results

Using ZL's Unified Archive, Bank Holding Company has achieved the following:

- ☒ The Bank was archiving over 6 million messages a day, of which 2.5 million were archived into WORM storage for FINRA/SEC compliance. As of the publication of this document, the Bank had ingested over 2 billion messages to support more than 173,000 mailboxes.

- ☒ Mailbox management support is fully deployed, and all mailbox items are archived. Only messages are stubbed. Policies are enforced so that messages in Junk Email or Deleted Items folders are stubbed daily; messages with attachments that are larger than 80KB are stubbed after 3 days; messages that are larger than 1MB but have no attachment are stubbed after 7 days; all messages that are greater than 2KB are stubbed after 30 days.
- ☒ The incumbent message archiving and supervision solution remains in place until the migration of legacy content is complete. The Bank anticipates this will be done by July 2010. Once migration is complete, ZL's Unified Archive will take over the supervision function.
- ☒ Bank Holding Company has tested and certified the self-service support for compliant retention and eDiscovery workflows. The compliance and legal teams have been trained to use these features. However, for now, Bank Holding Company's IT organization has a dedicated eDiscovery team that liaises with the legal and compliance functions. The eDiscovery team uses these self-service features to enforce the retention and legal hold policies. There are currently over 78 million messages on legal hold within the ZL Unified Archive. Also, the eDiscovery team is using the self-service features to conduct investigations and legal searches. However, the eDiscovery team has yet to fully employ the advanced analysis, tagging, and culling provided by the zDiscovery module. For now, the eDiscovery team does custodian and date range-based search and retrieval. The eDiscovery team turns over the results set to the legal team, which then sends the data to a third-party eDiscovery and litigation support provider. The Bank Holding Company recognizes that this is an inefficient way to conduct eDiscovery and investigations, given the training and third-party certified features already available in the ZL Unified Archive. There are ongoing parallel projects within the Bank to codify the best practice policies and processes for retention, legal hold, and analysis and first-pass review with the intent of eventually enabling the legal and compliance users to become more comfortable in using these self-service features.

## **ESSENTIAL GUIDANCE**

End users who are evaluating a message archiving solution to support their compliance, eDiscovery, and storage operational efficiency objectives are advised to consider the following:

- ☒ Collaborate very closely with internal stakeholders very early on. In the Bank Holding Company's case, the initial mailbox management use case was quickly expanded to support compliant supervision, retention, and eDiscovery and investigation because both legal and IT were acutely aware of each other's process, technology, and budget challenges.

- ☒ Be cognizant of the long-term strategic intent (both from an IT and a legal perspective). These objectives impact the architecture requirements and change management issues. The planning and gap analysis help the organization plan for the organizational transition and content migration issues. The Bank had identified its desired state (such as self-service features and widespread use of virtualization); the Bank also understood where it was architecturally and organizationally, and it planned the organizational, process, and technology road maps to get to its desired state.
- ☒ Have a corporate change management process in place. These processes should address changes from development environment through QA and user acceptance. Deployment, training, and incentives for users are critical.

## LEARN MORE

---

### Related Research

- ☒ *eDiscovery Priorities Among Corporations from Highly Regulated and Litigated Industries: What Happened in 2009?* (IDC #221802, January 2010)
- ☒ *Corporate eDiscovery Technology Trends 2009: Doing More with Less While Facing Increasing Complexity in eDiscovery* (IDC White Paper #220611, November 2009)

### Copyright Notice

This IDC research document was published as part of an IDC continuous intelligence service, providing written research, analyst interactions, telebriefings, and conferences. Visit [www.idc.com](http://www.idc.com) to learn more about IDC subscription and consulting services. To view a list of IDC offices worldwide, visit [www.idc.com/offices](http://www.idc.com/offices). Please contact the IDC Hotline at 800.343.4952, ext. 7988 (or +1.508.988.7988) or [sales@idc.com](mailto:sales@idc.com) for information on applying the price of this document toward the purchase of an IDC service or for information on additional copies or Web rights.

Copyright 2010 IDC. Reproduction is forbidden unless authorized. All rights reserved.