

Data Interoperability Community of Interest Business Case and Chapter Questions and Exercises

1.6 Questions and Exercises

1. What is the “state” of data interoperability in your enterprise? Rate it from “fantastic” to “sad.” Why do you think it is one rating or the other? How do you really know? What are your measures for computing your rating?
2. How much time, effort, and energy of your organization is expended creating the policies, procedures and rules that govern COIs versus accomplishing the real work of COIs? How much COI start-up time does your organization consume. If this time were “close to zero,” how would that help get real work accomplished?
3. How have the bureaucratic organizational activities that have occurred at the start of COIs affected the quantity and quality of the work accomplished? Has the lack of “getting out of the gates fast” dampened enthusiasm, negatively impacted your budgets, and lost credibility in your COI’s mission?
4. If this book was adopted “as-is,” would this book’s strategies regarding organizations, policies, and procedures affect the time, effort and energy that is able to be expended to achieve data interoperability? How could having all the “bureaucracy” engineered and ready to go before you start help?
5. Have you tried COIs in your enterprise regardless of what they are called? Have they worked? Why and why not? Have they brought benefits? What are they and how have they affected the “bottom line” of your organization?
6. Given that you are going to embark on the development of a reasonable quantity of interoperable databases and interchanges, what would the effect likely be on your current IT environment?
7. How much time and money are you likely to save from a reasonable quantity of interoperable databases and interchanges? How will you know and measure it?
8. What are the management decisions, strategies and plans that are likely to be affected by having a reasonable quantity of interoperable databases and interchanges?
9. What would be the benefits of just “adopting” this book’s COI organizational structures, policies, procedures, offices, roles, responsibilities, and products at the very start of a COI and then modifying this adopted way of running the COI after the first six months or a year? Would such a move stifle or enable the real work of a COI?

2.9 Questions and Exercises

1. Do you fundamentally agree with the key reasons for having Data Interoperability? How are these data interoperability key reasons manifest in your organization?
2. Do you agree that shared data is fundamentally a reflection of shared policy? If yes, why? If no, then why not? The book holds that “Data is executed policy.” Agree or disagree? If agree, then can you have shared data without shared policy?
3. This chapter has an expansive definition of Metadata? Do you agree? If yes, why? If no, why not? If you agree, then shouldn't the metadata database (i.e., metabase) hold all this metadata in an integrated and non-redundant fashion? Wouldn't all the artifacts associated with project planning just be another form of metadata?
4. How is your organization defining and managing its metadata? How can you have data interoperability without having metadata interoperability? How can you even hope to have any sort of data governance without first having metadata governance? Explain and give examples.
4. Do you agree or disagree with the notion of a database object class? If a database object class represents an entire policy of the enterprise, is it likely that the data structure supporting that policy can be represented as a single database table? If not, then database object classes have to be the focus of data interoperability specification rather than just tables of columns or individual columns so as to assure agreement on precision, granularity and timeliness. Agree or disagree? Explain and give examples.
5. Do you agree with the stated value proposition of data interoperability? If yes, why? If not, why not. Provide examples from within your own organization.
6. This chapter sets out a five levels for Information Systems Interoperability. Where does data interoperability fit within these levels? Are there parallel levels for data interoperability? If yes, why? If not, why not? Provide examples from within your own organization.
7. This chapter sets out six levels of Conceptual Interoperability. How do these levels relate to the five levels of Information System Interoperability? Do you agree with the relationships shown in Figure 4? If yes, why? If not, why not? Provide examples from within your own organization.
8. In this Chapter's Summary there are four bullet points. Do you agree that these four mechanisms are measurements of data interoperability achievement? If yes, why? If not, why not. Provide examples from within your own organization.

3.6. Questions and Exercises

1. Metadata are the “business records” of Information Technology support of the enterprise. Do you have a metadata database, that is, a metabase? If so, does it address the full spectrum of metadata set out in Chapter 2? If yes, is it integrated and non-redundant? If yes, then what has been the effect on the creation, use, and maintenance of “IT’s books?” Have you reduced costs? Increased productivity? Decreased the risk of maintenance? Have you increased the quality (i.e., interoperability) of your data? If no, why not?
2. Is your metadata too narrow in scope? “Technical” only? “Technical” means metadata of only operational databases and systems. There would be no metadata that defines enterprise architectures, information systems planning, data model or business information system.
3. Has there been a “my way or highway” solution and approach as opposed to an enterprise-wide multi-level approach? Provide examples from within your own organization.
4. In Section 3.1, do you agree with the characterization of the problems associated with a lack of comprehensive metadata? If yes, why? If not, why not? Provide examples from within your own organization.
5. The point of Section 3.2 is that all metadata must exist in a framework. It illustrates the use of the Knowledge Worker Framework as a mechanism of metadata characterization and organization. What are the good and bad points of having a framework? Can there be multiple frameworks? Can they, or “must” there be shared metadata across frameworks? How else can multiple frameworks be interrelated? Aren’t frameworks just “windows” into enterprise-wide metadata databases? Provide examples from within your enterprise of integrated frameworks and common metadata. What has been the benefit? Have such frameworks enabled the avoidance of “stove-pipes” of data and business information systems?
6. Section 3.3 describes a Data Interoperability Framework. It further identifies three contained architectures. How are these three architectures interrelated? Can these architectures stand alone? Should they? How should they be done, one after the other or independently. What are the advantages and drawbacks to the different approaches?
7. Do you agree with the interrelationships between the figures of this chapter, and those in Chapters 5 and 6 that depict data and process models? If you agree, then how would you organize development teams? What should be the key positions, roles, duties, and responsibilities? What should be the work products?
8. Section 3.4 and contained subsections describes and outlines the various contained metadata models for achieving data interoperability across the enterprise. Do you agree with the high level depictions of these models? Do they convey a coherent story? If you agree with the approach, why? If not, why not? Provide examples from within your own organization.
9. Section 3.5 sets out questions regarding metadata development and management. Are these the right questions? If you took an informal survey within your organization, what would your

tallies for “Strongly Agree” through “Strongly Disagree” be? Does this survey and the tallies make the case for metadata management? If you agree, why? If not, why not? Provide examples from within your own organization.

4.5 Questions and Exercises

1. *If you don't know where you're going, it doesn't matter much which road you take.* That's the essence of the exchange between Alice and the Cheshire cat in Alice and Wonderland. Mission models are the “Where you are going.” Missions are the hierarchically organized textual expositions of the idealized outcomes. How important is it to have clear, comprehensive, and consensus based missions before you start any metadata management effort?

2. Mission models can be 20-30 pages of text, so isn't it valuable to focus on just one well defined subset of the overall enterprise mission versus the whole enterprise mission? Doesn't that increase the change of success? What have your experiences been trying to tackle too large of a mission area? What have your experiences been when the areas you've tackled have been defined in isolation without regard to the overall enterprise? Explain and provide examples.

3. There should also be a mission for Data Interoperability. Where would that mission area fall within the overall enterprise mission? What aspects of the Data Interoperability mission overlap with other mission area? Does that mean there should have be shared data between those overlapping mission areas? What would be the likely result if the shared-data areas were defined in isolation? Explain and provide examples.

4. Section 4.2 sets out the mission for the overall data interoperability program. Do you agree with this missions? Should it be more, less, different? How does this overall program mission compare with what your organization has for its data interoperability mission? Is this mission different enough from what should be done that you should expend resources re-doing it before starting? If yes, why? If no, then how much time would be saved by just accepting it and moving on?

5. Section 4.3 briefly sets out the mission for developing individual data interoperability standards. Is yours different enough from what should be done that you should expend resources re-doing it before starting? If yes, why? If no, then how much time would be saved by just accepting it and moving on?

6. Section 4.3.1 through 4.3.5 sets out the missions for all the different groups within a data interoperability community of interest. Is yours different enough from what should be done that you should expend resources re-doing it before starting? If yes, why? If no, then how much time would be saved by just accepting it and moving on?

7. After a review of the mission sections, are they worth adopting, “right out of the box,” or would there be real “progress value” in taking two or months from the start of an effort to

redevelopment these from scratch? What significant increase in value would there be from such a re-defines effort? Wouldn't there be more value by adopting these, as is, and then revisiting them in six months to a year?

5.4 Questions and Exercises

1. Every collection of metadata must interrelate seamlessly, horizontally, vertically, and by depth. Horizontally means meta-objects having the same meta-object parent. Vertically implies meta-objects of different types related in a parent-child or "uncle" relationship. By depth, it means that the meta-objects that exist from different projects, or databases, across time are interrelated. Do you agree with this three dimensional characterization?

What benefits accrue by the integration non-redundancy, and inheritance? Does such a strategy enable team work and a greater quantity of consistency across a wider domain? If yes, why? If not, why not? Provide examples from within your own organization.

2. How much time, effort, and energy would be saved if your enterprise metadata were organized according to the meta-objects contained in this strategy?

3. If your organization does not have integrated metadata across all your projects, what is that costing the enterprise in terms of increased resolution time, increased construction of bridge data structures, semantic conflicts, mismatched precision, granularity, and timeliness? Could these problems have been avoided if there was integrated, non-redundant, and semantically harmonious metadata from which to build you databases and business information systems? If yes, why? If not, why not? Provide examples from within your own organization.

4. Do you fundamentally agree with the engineering of meta-objects as specified at the start of Chapter 5? That is, that each is a collection of tables, row-based processes, information systems to transform the meta-objects, and finally a collection of the object states for each meta-object? If yes, then aren't these the same constructs for all database oriented information systems?

5. When engineering the complete set of meta-object classes for a metabase, isn't it really the same overall process as engineering and designing any other database? If yes, then why? If no, what's really different? Provide examples from within your own organization.

6. A careful examination of Figures 12 thorough 22 show three classes of meta-objects: simple hierarchies, recursions, and networks. Simple hierarchies are depicted by a single arrow-head line between to two meta-objects. Figure 12, for example, has a simple relationship between Programming Language and Business Information System.

Recursions are depicted by a single arrow-head line from and to the same meta-object. Figure 12 also shows a recursive relationship between Business Information System and itself. Network meta-objects are depicted by two arrow-head lines from one meta-object to another.

Finally, Figure 12 shows a network relationship between Business Even Cycle and

Business Event Cycle Structure.

These three meta-object classes have all been proven critical through intense analysis of the metadata needed for enterprise architectures, data models, and process models. All are required. None are optional. An examination of the complete set of Figures 12 through 22 show about a dozen networks and about 18 recursions.

Should the metadata end-user be responsible for deeply knowing the complexity of these data structures, or should the supporting metabase system be responsible for dealing with all the complexity, navigation, integrity and non-redundancy? If you agree, what benefits accrue from the metabase system knowing and handling these complexities versus the end user having to know and handle these complexities? If you disagree, how would the complete set of end-users know what is required, how it should be interrelated, integrated, and made non-redundant? Provide examples from within your own organization of the benefits and costs for both sides.

7. If you didn't use a database oriented information system for collecting, storing, and interrelating metadata, what do you use? How is it faster, easier and more able to interrelate, be non-redundant, and current than a metabase? If it isn't, how much does that affect your ability to have enterprise-wide data interoperability?

8. Do you keep metadata for all these meta-object classes? If not, do you keep that metadata in different forms? What is the cost in terms of time, effort, and energy of having metadata in different forms? What could be saved if all your metadata was in a single metadata repository (metabase) and the metadata was integrated, interrelated, non-redundant and timely. Provide examples from within your own organization.

9. While the DoDAF framework in Section 5.2 is different from the Knowledge Worker Framework, it seems to require all the same meta-object classes as does the Knowledge Worker Framework. Isn't it more important to know what the framework requires than possibly the style and organization of the Framework? Does your organization have multiple or different frameworks? If yes, then how different are they in terms of requiring what ensures success? Provide examples of similarity and differences from your business.

6.8 Questions and Exercises

1. Metabase systems not only have databases that contain metadata, they also have very sophisticated information systems to enter, interrelate, and manage the metadata. Section 6.1 lists the major metadata information systems that must be supported. Do you agree, given the complex data structures contained in Figures 12 through 22 that the metadata information systems must be as sophisticated and complex? If yes, then how would just having simple data entry and update screens suffice? What would the knowledge requirement be on the novice end-user to properly enter, interrelated, integrate, and make all the enterprise metadata non-redundant? Provide examples from within your own organization.

2. After a careful review of all the different Metadata-Management Information Systems that are

described at a high level in Sections 6.2 through 6.6, provide examples from within your own organization.

3. Given the meta data models in Figures 12 through 22, are the high level descriptions of each of the metadata-management information systems sufficient to provide an understanding of the required processes that must occur? Provide examples from within your own organization.

4. Suppose a Metadata-Management Information Systems were restricted to just a simple “list-and-form” format, would that be sufficient to accomplish all the complex processes identified in the various process-description tables? What would be the effect on time, effort and resources if the end-users were responsible for knowing and accomplishing all the processes as opposed to the Metadata-Management Information Systems accomplishing these processes? How is your organization accomplishing these processes? How time-consuming are they to perform? How do you keep all the metadata interrelated, integrated, and non-redundant? Provide examples from within your own organization.

5. Many of the required meta-data objects are complex networks. See for example in Figure 14, and all the processes set out in Section 6.5.3, Data Element Model. These metadata models, one for metadata objects and the other metadata model for metabase system processes deal with seven network data structures. These network structures are recognized by the two lines that connect two different meta objects. Each of these two lines has a one-to-many arrow head. Now, to update such a required meta-data object, the end-user must know, within context the context of the existing network, 1) how to identify and display the network structure, 2) how to ensure that a circular reference is not being installed, and 3) that a duplicate reference is not being installed.

Note also in Figure 14 that several of the networks structures are related to each other. That means that the network constructed data is set within the context of other network structures. Now suppose the metabase system only has simple lists and forms. In such a case the end user would be 100% responsible for knowing about and determining the correct processing and linkages.

Should the metabase system handle all that, or should the end-user be required to understand all the intricacies of network processing and accomplish that correctly? Compare and contrast the time, effort and energy required to teach network structures to end users, and manually auditing their work versus having the metabase system handle all this effort for you.

Compare and contrast the relative level of sophistication that would be required on the end user of a manual approach versus a metabase system approach? Which way does your organization handle these real requirements now? What’s the cost in terms of metadata management if these real metadata object structure requirements are just ignored? Provide examples from within your own organization.

7.7 Questions and Exercises

1. First and foremost, a Community of Interest is an organization that either operates well or

chaotically. Highly organized COIs, that is, those with policies, procedures, milestones, deliverables, agendas, rules for voting, and the like run exceedingly well. The converse is also true. From your experience in your organization, is this true? If yes, provide examples, and compare and contrast with organizations in your enterprise where the organizations are chaotic? What are the key differences? How much more beneficial in terms of time, effort, and resources is the efficient organization versus the chaotic one? Provide examples from within your own organization.

2. The Chapter lists five classes of business events. What is the effect of business events. What are the characteristics of good and bad business events in your organization? Provide examples from within your own organization.

3. Section 7.1 identifies general business events such as establishing calendars and holding meetings. From the prototypical agenda presented in Figure 7.1.2, does it seem like meetings are well organized and “move” as a consequence of projects and papers? If yes, what’s been your experience with “meetings?” What has made good and bad meetings? When there are too many “bad” meetings, what’s been the result in terms of attendance, meeting objectives, making deliverables, and the like? Provide examples from within your own organization.

4. Section 7.2 identifies the types of subgroups that need to exist in a Data Interoperability Community of Interest. Why are these subgroups needed? What role does each subgroup play? What would be the likely result if one or more of the subgroups are missing? Or badly executed? Review your own organization and compare and contrast organizational efforts when key subgroups are missing or badly executed. Provide examples from within your own organization.

5. Section 7.3 identifies the key officers that should exist in every Data Interoperability Community of Interest. Most subgroups have this set of offices. Review the list of good and bad characteristics of Chair and Editor within this section. Do you agree with these characteristics? If yes, why? If no, why?

6. Section 7.4 indicates that this very book is generally a program management plan for accomplishing data interoperability in the enterprise. After reviewing the contents of the remaining chapters, do you think that is an acceptable assertion? If yes, why? If no, why not??

Review management plans of your organization and compare and contrast them with the overall content of this book in terms of scope, mission, functions, roles, offices, deliverables, and the like. If this book was adopted as-is, and then reviewed for modifications after six or so months, would that have a positive or negative impact on the schedule and ability to complete the work of a data interoperability community of interest? Compare and contrast with other program management plans in your organization. Which approach would be faster, and more efficient? Provide examples from within your own organization.

7. Section 7.5 enumerates the key milestones for the creation of any Data Interoperability standard produced by a Data Interoperability Community of Interest. Which milestone will take the longest? Which is the most important?

Does your organization have a similar set of milestones for its work? If not, why not? How has not having recognized and completed milestones affected the velocity, quantity, and quality of work accomplished? Compare and contrast with milestones of your enterprise. How are they different or similar?

Suppose you just adopted the milestones set out here with no modification, how would that help or hurt? Could you get to “real work” faster? Provide examples from within your own organization where you spent four to six months developing all these materials. How did that affect the enthusiasm, workload, and overall budget that was allocated to develop a data interoperability solutions?

8.9 Questions and Exercises

1. The opening section of this chapter lists the set of functions that are to be performed by the various subgroups within a Data Interoperability Program and also within a given Community of Interest. After a quick review of the functions how are these functions accomplished in your organization? Same? Differently? Explain.

2. The duties of the offices of Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Editor have been drawn from the experiences of other highly successful Communities of Interest. After reviewing these offices and their duties, are these the necessary set of duties? If these are all accomplished, and assuming due diligence by the office holder, will the office be carried out in an acceptable manner? Will data interoperability standards emerge? Is it clear from these offices and duties that accomplishment rather than personality is key?

3. Section 8.2 and its contained subsections sets out the functions that need to be accomplished by the Data Interoperability Program as a whole. Are these the right set of functions? Have the functions been described to indicate direction rather than strangle initiative and creativity? Are any key functions missing? If so, what are they?

4. Section 8.2.6 describes the functions of the Standards Development Board. How key is this board? What would happen if this Board were improperly staffed? Or, if the members of this Board had a specific “agenda” to pursue?

After reviewing the subsections, can you see that when the functions are followed Data Interoperability Standards emerge? If so, why, If not, why?

Compare and contrast the functions of the Standards Development Board with a similar organization in your enterprise. Are they engineered the same? How different? Is one better structured than the other?

5. Section 8.2.6.4 and 8.2.6.5 directly relate to Communities of Interest. The first section identifies the functions of the management of Communities of Interest. The second section sets out the process of discovering new Communities of Interest and determining whether they are needed including creating all the necessary material to justify their existence.

How does your organization discover the need for Communities of Interest? Is the

process adequate? What is missing? If something's missing, how will it hurt the proper discovery and engineering of COIs?

6. Section 8.3 and all its subsections detail rather extensively the functions of Communities of Interest. After a careful review of the process models contained in each of the 8.3.1 subsections, are these processes the necessary ones to then create a Data Interoperability Standard? Compare and contrast how standards are proposed to be created in this book versus your organization. Which is more comprehensive and complete? Which is likely to produce better results?

If the process models were adopted, as is, could the work of creating data interoperability standards move faster? Wouldn't all the effort of reinventing the processes that are already known to work be avoided? If so, then how much faster could the work start and how many arguments could be avoided on deciding all the different process model strategies and deliverables?

If the metabase (which has a free version available from the Whitemarsh website) were employed, wouldn't that dramatically increase the quantity, quality, and velocity of meta-objects that could be stored as there wouldn't be an effort required for designing, implementing, and maintaining the information system that supports meta-object definition, instantiation, and interrelationships?

It has been the clear recommendation of the U.S. Department of Defense that Data Interoperability Communities of Interest have a six-month golden window to produce or die. By die they mean, death by bureaucratic inertia. If this book and the metabase are adopted, can't the Community of Interest immediately start instead of wasting that valuable six months? Once products start rolling out the door, wouldn't the experience then exist to know just what needs to be changed? Compare and contrast the process of being able to immediately start real and productive work with the process of taking the first six or so months figuring it out. What's the effect on the volume, velocity, quality, and quantity of deliverables? The cost of deliverables? The enthusiasm to keep working? Provide examples from your own organization.

7. Section 8.3.2 is focused on the Maintenance of Data Interoperability Standards. After a review of the contents of these sections, how critical is an orderly and careful process of Data Interoperability Standards maintenance once these standards have been accomplished and are employed in the myriad of business information systems that have adopted them? Compare and contrast this process in this book with what your organization as established. What's different?

If your organization has no formal process, wouldn't this one be much better than your current one?

8. Section 8.4 is focused on officer appointments. How important are officers? Can they make or break a Community of Interest? Which is worse, a timid one or a dictator? Are there any implied functions missing from the contained subsections in this area? Compare and contrast how "officers" are appointed in your Corporate Communities of Interest. Should they be elected or appointed? Is there a right approach?

9.5 Questions and Exercises

1. This chapter enumerates and describes the organizations contained in a Data Interoperability Program and also Communities of Interest. After a brief review of the various organizations listed and described in Sections 9.2 and 9.3, are these the right organizations? If yes, why? If no, why not? Provide examples of similar organizations within your business.
2. After a careful review of the Data Interoperability Program committee organizations, do these organizations properly match the meta-objects and processes that have to be built from Chapters 5 and 6, and to these organizations match the Business Events and Functions from Chapters 7 and 8?
3. Why are rules for membership so important? What happens if one organization within your enterprise dominates a Community of Interest?
4. Why are voting rights so important? What happens when one organization is able to dominate the votes on Data Interoperability Standards issues?
5. Why is it so important for the various organizations within a Community of Interest to be able to work together and through near unanimous decisions?

10.10 Questions and Exercises

1. Why are “positions” so important?
2. Why should there be different classes of membership? Full, Associate, Observers, and Liaisons. Why should full memberships be restricted to only those organizations committed to fully implement a Data Interoperability Standard?
3. Why are there additional Membership rules for Communities of Interest? Why should COI memberships be spread across multiple enterprise organizations?
4. Why are there special rules that apply specifically to the Officers of these Committees.

11.8 Questions and Exercises

1. This chapter enumerates and describes a collection of documents that are necessary for successful Data Interoperability Communities of Interest. After a brief review, how are these documents critical to the creation of your Data Interoperability Committees and/or the creation of a Data Interoperability Standard?
2. Section 11.1 sets out a four page table that identifies and describes the required entries for a Data Interoperability Standard. Is this the required information for starting a Data Interoperability Standard?

3. Section 11.2 sets out a multi-page table that identifies and describes the required entries for the various groups in the overall Data Interoperability Program. Is this information sufficient to provide all members of all subgroups the information they need to ensure there are not conflicting or overlapping Data Interoperability Standards?

4. Section 11.3 sets out the overall format and content description of a Data Interoperability Standard. Since these standards can be hundreds to several thousand pages long, it is critical to understand whether the categories of information are the necessary and sufficient set.

After carefully review these sections, if they are provided in the Data Interoperability Standards document, is there sufficient information to design, build and maintain databases and supporting business information systems that represent uses of the Data Interoperability Standard? If not, why?

Compare and contrast the information required in this format with that required to build a database and supporting business information systems in your organization. Is one more sufficient than the other?

5. Sections 11.4 and 11.5 identify and describe the various document formats that should be standard fare for the moving the program and scope of work of the Data Interoperability Communities of Interest forward. How do these documents call for the critical work to be done? Provide examples from your organizations.

6. Section 11.5.2.3 contains the overall structure, format and description of Data Interoperability Standard change proposals. After a careful review of this format, can you see that if specified that you could build interoperable systems and databases from this information? If yes, why? If no, why not?

7. Section 11.5.3 outlines what should be in a Letter Ballot on any Data Interoperability Standard. If this information is provided are there then clear directions on what and how to report a vote?

8. Section 11.5.4 outlines what should be in Ballot Comments associated with any Letter Ballot. If this information is provided are there then clear directions on what to do to repair and/or change the Data Interoperability Standard?

9. Section 11.5.5 outlines an overall process for getting hotels, meeting rooms, and the like. If all these items are accomplished wouldn't there be a good meeting? How much time has your organization spent on arranging meetings only to find that key things have been forgotten? How do these Sections on meetings help? Compare and contrast your organization's way of engineering and executing meetings? Provide examples from within your organization.

12 5 Questions and Exercises

1. Meetings are not what makes progress. Rather, projects and within projects, change proposals

make progress. From the list in Section 12.1, are these project classes the sufficient set to then cause progress and to operate in an orderly way? If yes, why? If no, why not?

2. After reviewing the sets of Data Interoperability Program projects in Section 12.2, are there any that are missing? What is the likely achievement from each project class? How can there be an assurance that the results will cause integration of all the Data Interoperability Projects?

3. What is the likely effect in terms of time, effort, and resources by requiring that all the Data Interoperability Standards be developed more or less the same way?

4. What is the likely effect in terms of time, effort, and resources if the work products of the various Data Interoperability Standards projects are stored in a metabase that is integrated, interrelated, and non-redundant across all the work products of all the Data Interoperability Standards projects?

5. What would be the effects in terms of time, effort, and resources if all the projects are accomplished using the metabase in a stove-pipe fashion?

6. What would be the effects in terms of time, effort, and resources on all the projects with respect to integration, interrelationships and non-redundancy if they are accomplished without a metabase and without a metadata management tool?

7. Section 12.3 lists the types of Community of Interest projects. The subsections of 12.3 describe each type and subtype of the projects. Are there any project classes missing? If so, what is the likely effect on the development of Data Interoperability Standards?

13.10 Questions and Exercises

1. Rules, rules, rules. Everybody's got to have rules. Why? What is the likely effect of creating and managing a Data Interoperability Program without rules? What will be the effect on the organizations, projects, products, and achievements?

2. The opening section of this Chapter has 8 classes of rules. How would these classes of rules address issues that arise in any Data Interoperability Community of Interest setting?

3. Section 13.1 enumerates five different sets of rules for meetings. If these rules are followed, what are the chances for orderly meetings? If good, why? If not good, why not?

4. Carefully review the meeting rules and compare and contrast the set of rules with characteristics of good and bad meetings that occur in your enterprise. What are the similarities and differences? How do the differences affect good order and progress?

5. Given a meeting of 25 staff over three days, and a burdened rate of \$100 per hour per staff

member, meetings cost about \$60,000 each not counting preparation time, travel, per-diem, meeting facility expenses and the like. What is there to show from meetings that are poorly run versus expertly run as opposed to meetings that are run like well-oiled machines with agendas, papers, crisp decision making and the like?

6. Carefully review the rules for voting in Section 13.2. Are they adequate? Do they cover all the necessary situations? How many situations have you encountered when there were disputes over when something was settled or not? Would the rules in these sections have dealt with these situations?

7. Review Section 13.2.2.1. Does that cover the rules necessary for a decision? Contrast that with a Super Majority decision in Section 13.2.2.2. When should one method of decision be used over the other? Should the Super Majority decision rule be for every committee action? Which ones? What is the criteria for determining which?

8. The world is run by the Golden Rule. He who has the gold, rules. Carefully review Section 13.5, and 13.7. How do the rules contained in these sections relate to the other Finance sections, that is, Sections 8.2.3 and 9.2.5 support each other. How can a Data Interoperability Program operate efficiently or effectively without adequate finances and finance management.

9. Section 13.7.8 sets out the description and plan for Special Events. Is the information required for the plan adequate? What is missing and what would be the effect of the missing information on the planning and execution of the special event?