

Summary Notes

from the Table Leads and Plenary Sessions



Data Management – Enabling Open Data and Interoperability

<i>Summary of Responses to Questions</i>			
<i>DAMA Segment</i>	<i>Question 1</i>	<i>Question 2</i>	<i>Question 3</i>
1. Governance	Low	Low	Low - Medium
2. Data Architecture	Low	Low	Low - Medium
3. Data Development	Low	Low	Low - Medium
4. Database Operations	Very Low	Very Low	Medium
5. Data Security	Very Low	Very Low	Medium
6. Reference and Master Data	Very Low	Very Low	Low - Medium
7. DW/BI	Very Low	Low - Medium	Medium
8. Document & Content Management	Very Low	Low - Medium	Low - Medium
9. Meta-Data	Very Low	Very Low	Low - Medium
10. Data Quality	Very Low	Very Low	Low

Legend: Very Low = 0-2 Hands, Low = 3-5 Hands, Low - Medium = 6 – 10 hands, Medium = 10-15 hands

Summary Notes from Plenary Sessions

Segments 1 Governance and Segment 2 – Data Architecture

- No clear separation of functions
- Segment 1 – Need roles and responsibilities – service model to do Data Management
- Need for awareness – program focus vs project
- Segment 1 – program governance – Goals 1,3,5, Data governance Goals 2 a& 4
- Solution level vs enterprise level
- Risk is not mentioned in governance

Segment 3 – Data Development

- Overlap with security and data quality segments
- Lifecycle process needed
- Monitor data usage
- Information lifecycle
- Data base vs data stored
- Technical aspects of data operations is too much
- Data Store vs Data Management- clarify
- TBS suite of Policies

Segment 4 – Database Operations

- Data stewardship vs data management?

Segment 5 – Security

- Auditing – maybe should be in Governance
- Risk assessment and business acceptance
- Overlap with Security Policy Suite
- Emergency/continuity and backup – required
- Define stakeholders

- **Add research**
- **Data sharing?**
- **Maybe call data sharing and security**

Segment 6 – Reference and Master Data

- **Need a definition for Data and Master Data**

Segment 7 – DW/BI

- **Solution should not be included**
- **Cover in data integration**
- **Not core data management function – more of a business function**
- **Definition ok – solution is not**
- **Goal #2 is too much – split it up**
- **Definition of BI is broad and different to many people**

Segment 8 – Document & Content Management

- **Redundant**
- **Put under Information Management directive**
- **Goal # 5 – not applicable – refer to Segment 4 – Goal 3**

Segment 10 – Data Quality

- **Lots of overlap with other segments**
- **Stick to the “what” vs “How”**
- **Goals #2 – review definition**
- **Add Goal #4 – re security**

Summary Notes from Table Leads

Data Governance

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?
 - We need such a directive, the “What” is justified and needed, the “How To” would represent and issue
 - This is critical
 - Needs stronger enforcement from the Center – “intent” is not enough – direction and enforcement is needed
 - Concern with the details
 - Structured vs unstructured data
 - Data as an output of a research project – not business process
 - Research data available thru international site
 - Who is the overall sponsor to ensure accountability?
 - Does governance include ownership?
 - Who owns the data
 - Who owns combined data when one posts data and another post data
 - Responsibilities and Accountabilities in GC?
 - Definition of data – raw data vs information on data
 - Issue of stewardship vs ownership
 - Service models are essential – needs to be elevated and fixed to outputs
 - Needs a supporting framework linking business and data professionals

2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
 - If clearly define – ok, but scope needs to be clear
 - Definition of data should be well specified
 - Standards and procedures are not one size fit all
 - Content is weak

3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
 - Goal #4 is not the place to handle and resolve data related issues
 - Where is the business involvement in this segment
 - Goal #5 is a definite
 - Should be managed by a program
 - Need awareness

- Stewardship is an important part of governance
- Missing goal – engage business
- Culture – sharing won't happen unless people know why
- Goals 2-4 OK – 1,3 & 5 are more program concerns
- Business should be included
- IM professionals should be there under participants
- A business function not an IT function
- Alignment to corporate business strategy
- Data ownership is not mentioned
- Recognition of data value will be hard to determine
- People/culture aspects are missing (level of commitment, buy-in, change management, strategy)
- Mention service to goals
- Leadership, ownership, accountability are not mentioned
- No mention of Risk
- Promoter awareness and culture

Data Architecture

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?
2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
 - May be overlapping with RK Directive
 - Must be aligned with other initiatives
 - Difficult to get master blueprint for research data, as datasets are so different across disciplines
3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
 - Goal 2 is vague, precision is needed, context or architecture?? Structure
 - More goals required – more than just conceptual or planning
 - A bit misleading – incomplete
 - Should be more aligned with a robust architecture framework such as TOGAF
 - Not enough focus on Enterprise level
 - Architecture does not define needs – that is the business/strategy
 - If not architecture – DMBOK does need something about identifying/documenting data – main source/system of record
 - Rename segment but bring architecture into it

- Architecture is a means of identification
- What is the definition of High Quality data?
- Data inventories are needed
- Common data/tombstone data should have direction from TBS (program does not count)
- GSRM – 19 output types
- There needs to be a blending of segments – can they be collapsed into the directive?
- Should not be piecemeal
- Needs strong overview or enterprise view – e.g. listing vital elements/ontology
- Conceptual model/ EA Framework needed
- Needs to reflect context not data element
- Volumetrics of complexity of all the data to be defined
- Should standards be included in the inputs?
- Needs clarification – design piece of architecture is too spread-out
- Define separate design for implementation
- Define “Why” before going to How

Data Development

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?
2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
 - May not need to be in the directive
 - Hard to enforce and manage (Change Management issues)
 - Should be project to project based
 - Need to consider scope or level – whole of government vs enterprise vs project (department)
3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
 - Some of these traditionally fall under Data Architecture
 - Where is the business?
 - Overlap with Data Architecture
 - Need to distinguish enterprise level and solution level
 - Not enough emphasis on the fact that this is solution specific
 - Reuse is missing – sounds like it’s always new
 - Goal #1 – capture/filter vs identify – define

- Possible integration of some of these elements with others in the directive (e.g. Data Architecture & Data Development)
- Does not need to have “design data structures”
- Services seems to be misplaced
- Design seems misplaced
- Quality should be higher on the list
- Too late for develop standards step
- Data modelling are a part
- Should not be included

Data Operations Management

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?
 - Is this segment “Operations” or Database?”
 - What is the vision in terms of the TBS Policy Suite? Is DAMA going to be implemented among the suite or just the Data Stewardship?
 - With research data there is an expensive process to manage data
 - Some guideline would be very useful to departments
2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
 - Set a requirement for life-cycle management
 - Add information lifecycle – structured and unstructured
 - A bit too IT specific – less focus on IM, which needs to be addressed
 - Too detailed for standard/directive if we talk about Database operations Management vs data Operations Management
3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
 - Goal #2 – change wording and add information lifecycle
 - Overlap with Data Quality & Security
 - Goal #2 – add info lifecycle
 - Slight overlap with Security but mostly ok
 - Same for Data Quality – integrity is one aspect of Data Quality
 - Bring IT & IM together
 - IM responsible for authorities for disposition
 - Documenting the lifecycle of structured data
 - How long to keep it for?

- Retiring data
- Monitoring data usage (should be added – see 2.6)
- Emergence management, contingency & backup
- Need to define structured data
- Perhaps data security requirements could be included as part of inputs – unless inferred
- Why is protect and integrity included in the goal of data operations? Is it not database operations? Or is it data itself?
- Where are procedural/operations policies
- Where is the implementation part?
- Link structured and unstructured

Data Security Management

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?
 - Essential – no issues
2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
 - Connect the dots with other policy instruments on security
 - Possible overlap of Security policy suite
 - Be careful near data security policies – backup contingencies
 - Potential with overlap with Security Policy Suite
 - Will this directive interact with other directives/policies – e.g. EAA policy?
3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
 - Stakeholders needs to be defined – who are they?
 - What about auditing, stakeholders, Intellectual property
 - Definition – not sure auditing belongs here – perhaps in Data Governance
 - Nothing about risk assessment/risk acceptance by business
 - Would like to see parallels in TBS Policy Suite to see how this is dealt with across the board – does it need to be dealt with here?
 - Need to make risk assessment more explicit
 - Where to fit Risk frameworks/management?
 - Security is to address risk management after all
 - Move 4.1 to Segment 5
 - Move 5.2 to Segment 4

- Duplicated security policies across – therefore suggest existing security is applied
- Who is enforcing compliance?
- Remove “information” from definition – you can’t manage security on information – only on data
- Remove Audit

Reference & Master Data Management

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?
 - More of a How concern that a What
 - This is a prerequisite for data architecture
 - Too low level
2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
 - Yes – How not What
 - Every organization will have different requirements around “Golden Records”
 - It is needed as it forces standardization
3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
 - There is no mention of data stewards
 - Goal #3 – include business value
 - May add linkage to metadata
 - Not sure Reference & Master Data should be mixed – internal/external
 - Why do they get separate goals? – these goals should apply to all data
 - Ref and Master data – are more about How, not What
 - It is about consistency
 - What is a candidate for reference?
 - No differentiation between data and metadata
 - Move under governance – this is an architectural piece – it is data quality
 - It is a design standard not a directive

Data Warehousing and Business Intelligence Management

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?

- Same as Ref and Master Data – this is more to How again
 - Need 2 levels of the Wheel
 - Need to do better with less
 - We should split into two parts – Data Warehousing and BI Management
 - Do not include individual solutions in the directive
2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
- What sort of thing would the document say?
 - A lot of it is business context specific
 - Hard to see what GC can define as “Required”
 - This can only be used if an organization has implemented data management
 - Leading edge – not cost effective in a time of fiscal restraint
 - Data warehousing is too detailed
3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
- Goal #2 is too big and complex
 - Enable to deliver previous components
 - Solution focused
 - Provides analytical data
 - Too DW specific – solution specific
 - Definition is ok, but name says DW
 - Need to include data archives for research data
 - Define business rules to create data – business solution level
 - BI has other definitions outside of IT
 - Split the components – DW and BI
 - Remove warehouse – only a solution to one problem - prefer data integration
 -

Document & Content Management

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?
- Does not belong to the wheel
 - It is a family of data management
 - This is redundant at the directive level – RF directive and ISO

2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
 - This segment should be aligned under the umbrella of Enterprise Information Management
 - Does not belong
 - Should be collapsed in the policy
 - TBS need to enforce organizations to do good IM – i.e. GCDOCS as a minimum standard for orgs to have implemented
 - Redundant with RK directive
3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
 - Should be dropped from the wheel
 - Overlap with IM pieces
 - Goals re controlling costs may be utopia
 - Customer should be data consumer

Meta-Data Management

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?
 - Segment is needed and needs to be explicitly stated – not sure it needs to be a separate segment on the wheel or if metadata can be explicitly included in other segments
2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
 - No, but need to be careful to stick to What – a lot of concerns about metadata management are about “How” which probably don’t belong in the directive level policy instrument
 - Collapse with architecture for policy purposes
 - Support organizations to do this work in a centralized fashion (i.e. Doc Mgt systems together with web and data systems)
3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
 - Goal #2 – enable data integration thru integration and consolidation metadata
 - Question re: security
 - Add Data Inventory aspects
 - Should be more business focused
 - Clarify Metadata definition – means different things to different people

- Overlaps with other core data management functions
- Integrate metadata from diverse sources (vague)
- Setting common definition through context
- Meta meta-data reference model (cascading)
- Lifecycle and change management
- Needs to be aligned with existing standards for metadata
- Issue with “ensure” meta-data quality and security – if original data are inaccurate metadata will be as well
- May need to move to governance

Data Quality Management

1. Do you have issues with the segment being needed to implement Data Management?
 - It is needed
2. Do you have issues if the segment is included in the Directive on Data Stewardship?
 - It should be presented as a layer that applies to many disciplines
3. Do you have issues with the definition and goals as DAMA defines them?
 - No stewards mentioned – a custodian of data quality business rules
 - Some discussion of whether the notion of capture/manage quality at source should be included somewhere
 - Need clearly defined data quality parameters – mapped back to purpose
 - Need to put metrics in place
 - Remove “into systems development lifecycle” – bullet 2
 - Define quality – accuracy, reliability, client need, etc.
 - As defined – it is more about planning (for a directive) not implementation and control
 - A directive would not indicate how to implement it
 - Ensure fitness of data – how do you measure?
 - How do you measure “Improve”?