

Challenge Paper: As-Is Feedback Report The Challenge Dialogue System™

Developing a Vision, Framework and Actions for Sharing Forest Information

Prepared for —
Forest Information Management Workshop

Sponsored by —
Nelson Lah, BC Ministry of Forests and Range
Melanie Boyce, BC Ministry of Forests and Range
Evert Kenk, Integrated Land Management Bureau

Co-Championed by —
Mark Todd, Canfor Ltd.
Evert Kenk, Integrated Land Management Bureau
Amin Kassam, Integrated Land Management Bureau

Prepared by —
Dwight Scott Wolfe, Tesera Systems Inc.
R. Keith Jones, Innovation Expedition Inc.

May 18, 2007



The Challenge Dialogue System™ (CDS)

The Challenge Dialogue System

We are using the Challenge Dialogue System™ (CDS) developed by the *Innovation Expedition* to guide our Dialogue prior to and during the face-to-face workshop on the development of a strategic action plan

CDS is an efficient and effective vehicle for engaging diverse stakeholders and assisting them to collaborate and innovate in order to accomplish a complex task. CDS is a structured but flexible methodology for moving a team of people from ideas to action quickly and effectively. More information on CDS is available at the Innovation Expedition's website at: www.innovationexpedition.com.



Dwight Scott Wolfe, Tesera Systems Inc.

Keith Jones, R. Keith Jones and Associates

Innovation Expedition Affiliates

Please e-mail any further comments to:

Dwight Scott Wolfe

dwight.wolfe@tesera.com

Thank you! - Introduction & Continuing to Set Context

May 18, 2007

This is just a quick note of *thanks* to those of you that took the time from your busy schedules to respond to the *Challenge Paper*¹.

Reactions and responses to the paper are included in this *As-Is Feedback Report* document. We have had a total of 34 respondents from a total circulation of one hundred and fifty (i.e.: 23% response rate). We thought you would be interested in seeing the “as-is” feedback comments so you can see the range of opinion on this complex topic.

You have provided valuable and insightful reactions and comments. This information will help us to understand to what extent the Challenge Dialogue participants are aligned, where they are not aligned and where there is still some confusion.

You have expressed some great thoughts on how we need to progress and on what is most important right now, and you have offered some good ideas on items and initiatives that might offer us some direction.

We have taken your collective feedback and will prepare a Synthesis Report and Action Plan that will strive to reflect where we are at collectively. Based on the feedback there is a lot of strong will and commitment to move forward with some tangible actions in certain key areas – so that’s what we’ll aim for in the Action Plan!

Thanks again for your interest and input.

Kindest regards,

Mark Todd, Amin Kassam, Evert Kenk and the Organizing Team

¹ The *Challenge Paper* is one of a number of tools developed by the *Innovation Expedition* for its *Challenge Dialogue System*TM - a disciplined process that engages diverse groups on discovering collaborative and innovative solutions to complex challenges. www.innovation.com

Table of Contents

INPUT REQUEST #1 — KEY CHALLENGE STATEMENT..... 1

INPUT REQUEST #2 — BACKGROUND STATEMENTS 1

INPUT REQUEST #3 — EXPECTED OUTCOMES..... 5

INPUT REQUEST #4 — ASSUMPTIONS..... 11

**INPUT REQUEST #5 — INITIAL IDEAS AND QUESTIONS TO STIMULATE THE DIALOGUE
..... 17**

INPUT REQUEST #6 — WORKING DEFINITIONS..... 50

INPUT REQUEST #7 — NEXT STEPS AND OTHER COMMENTS..... 52

Input Request #1 — Key Challenge Statement

■ Please review the Key Challenge and provide your responses in writing in the accompanying Feedback Form.

Are you aligned with our Key Challenge? What is missing? What is included but is not relevant in your view?

Respondent #1

1. Yes, and while the existing world of data sharing between government and industry is by no means perfect – there are lots of difficulties and problems – I was under the impression there already was a reasonable shared vision – more-or-less one stop access to data from the LRDW, and an agreement to work to correct current issues.

Respondent #2

2. How will you know you've got the right people engaged in the present process? How do you intend to enable interested people to get engaged in the future?

Respondent #4

3. Yes. I think every system and business area is aligned to the shared vision to certain extent, if not fully. I think one of the missing components is data quality. A shared vision for information sharing cannot separate data quality, which goes beyond the common definition of data integrity. Investing resource in data quality (definition, standards, improvement methods, continuous improvement) up front will save a lot of waste down the road. Prevention is the best cure.

Respondent #5

4. Yes, if using the term alignment means a level of agreement and support from myself.
5. However, the challenge appears to have missed the transition or step required to move from dialogue on issues/opportunities embracing a range of ideas to “alignment on these views”.
6. Have we defined “effective data sharing”?

Respondent #6

7. Looks good

Respondent #7

8. Yes I am aligned but would be more ambitious and strive for a meaningful agreement and agreement on the infrastructure and approach to actually achieve useful data sharing with minimal overhead.

Respondent #8

9. Yes

Respondent #9

10. We need to keep cost and efficiencies front and center in this dialogue. Many ideas may surface but we must align our thoughts on a sustainable direction.

Respondent #10

11. Yes

Respondent #11

12. Yes, on corporate information. However there has never been a good procedure established between Industry and Government to get local information in the corporate bases. This is to ensure the bases are more up to date and correct.
13. Better partnership with local government and Industry is needed

Respondent #13

14. Yes

Respondent #14

15. Yes, I believe we need to focus on a long-term, low (no) cost solution to sharing of information that benefits all users. The challenge statement certainly identifies the starting point for this.

Respondent #15

16. Aligned.
17. All relevant

Respondent #16

18. I'm generally aligned however I find the statement a bit general so I'm still a bit cautious because I'm not totally knowledgeable about all aspects of other custodians ability to effectively share data.
19. Also, I'm still a bit confused with the term data-sharing as I think many of the concerns are not related to data sharing (both the provider and requester provides data) but more about access to quality data. However if we stayed focus on understanding the – issues and opportunities - I think we'll be fine.

Respondent #17

20. “Design a Common Data Sharing Framework” reduces the scope too much. It was right in the above paragraph of “effective sharing of forest information”. Data without any supporting meta-data from business, guidelines/regulations and legislation make it difficult to clearly communication between the group.

Respondent #18

21. I think the key challenge is the building of the data sharing framework and we should keep a very sharp focus on that. Engaging in a dialogue and shaping a shared vision are process steps.
22. One of the keys will be to define the impediments to data sharing and classify them correctly as to policy, procedure, technology, content standard, etc. otherwise the debate will be all over the place

Respondent #19

23. Yes
24. More clarity between Data Sharing and Data Exchange – from the Data Custodianship Guidelines:
 - Data Sharing is the use of a common pool of data across multiple organizations, independent of applications and technology. The concept of a single source for any particular piece of data is implied by this definition.

- Data Exchange is the process of extracting data from one organization and providing it to some other organization for inclusion in their data stores – where mutual agreement has been struck between the two organizations

Respondent #20

25. Yes

26. In today' environment of ever increasing demands for solutions to a wide range of forest management questions, having access to reliable and up to date information is critical in order to be successful.

Respondent #21

27. Yes, I am aligned with the Key Challenge. I don't see anything missing. This is a good starting point from which to frame the discussion

Respondent #31

28. Weird question in "alignment"

Respondent #32

29. Yes, I agree with the key challenge statement

Are you aligned with the scope and focus of this Dialogue at least for this initial phase of the collaboration?

Respondent #1

30. Yes, a key challenge for government and industry is working together to move the vision and partially-working business practices to fully shared and accessible data in a working reality. So, less visioning and more actioning.

Respondent #2

31. Not sure. I need to understand the business drivers: Are they reliable or stable, are they subject to fluctuation? Other industry also depends on sharing forest inventory data, and the forest industry requires their activity data.

Respondent #4

32. Yes, but operationally speaking, how does one share data when business rules and data are defined so differently across business areas? Nonetheless, this is a good start and a must do. A metadata or a data discovery portal may be a good start for the entire sector.

Respondent #5

33. Yes for this initial phase.

Respondent #6

34. Looks good.

Respondent #7

35. Yes, the scope is plenty ambitious.

Respondent #8

36. Yes

Respondent #9

37. Yes. May want to ensure it is clear that (c.) includes roads and streams.

Respondent #10

38. Scope should include forest information maintained by forest industry....forest industry is the custodian of a collectively large set of data that overlaps with many of the government data sets mentioned.

Respondent #11

39. Yes

Respondent #14

40. Yes

Respondent #15

41. There is much more information that could fall within scope of Forestry Information, but agree with need to keep focus to this narrow but important set

Respondent #16

42. Yes, with the above caveats.

Respondent #17

43. Yes

Respondent #18

44. The scope only indicates which data sets are in scope for inclusion in a data sharing environment. It should include limits as to what aspects of the data itself is in scope (e.g. form, format, currency, accuracy, resolution, metadata, content, etc.); or by data sharing do we mean only the exchange of best available information? If data content and quality are seen

Respondent #19

45. Yes

Respondent #21

46. Yes, I am aligned with the scope and focus of this dialogue. The scope is manageable for the initial phase

Respondent #32

47. I agree with the scope and focus as outlined. It should be noted that some of the information (such as ownership) is a complex process and not a simple dataset one can reference.

Input Request #2 — Background Statements

- **Please review the Background Statements and provide your responses in writing in the accompanying Feedback Form. Please refer to the Background Statement numbers when appropriate.**

In your view are there any Background Statements that need clarification which should be added or that are not relevant?

Respondent #1

1. *Background #6* Government in 2002 entered into a long-term commitment to electronic document and records management, and chose Tower Software, Inc's "Total Recorded Information Management" (TRIM) product. The "other" TRIM should be mentioned and explained to reduce confusion. MoFR is in the midst of full implementation, and has distinguished the records software by referring to it as EDRMS/TRIM (Enterprise Document and Records Management System/TRIM).
2. *Background #10* Since the KDSP is not using "custodian" and "steward" in the recognized, defined sense, won't the current explanation of their objectives tend to confuse matters? Their stated goals are obviously local, and not supportive of province-wide processes. This should likely be tactfully, but explicitly, pointed out in their Background Statement.
3. *Background #13* typo "The Council is current in..." -- currently

Respondent #2

4. NRSIWG: Terms of reference, roles and responsibilities, and accountabilities?
5. Whose responsibility is it currently to address these needs for multiple users? The NDSN and KSDN are two initiatives that indicate the need for such a group (but in a larger sense).

Respondent #3

6. It is interesting that the Challenge Paper references the North West Data Sharing Network (NWDSN), see www.nwdsn.org, as an example of a Current Data Sharing Business Model. The NWDSN should also be included under the section of Current Opportunities with Data Sharing. I was involved with this group as one of the original Directors of the Board. Don Morgan is the MOFR contact at the Smithers (Skeena _ Stikine), District, as he is currently the NWDSN Executive Director. This group has done some good work as far as creating a Governance Model, and keeping the Data Sharing active, and the data current, accurate and available to those that need it at the operational level. Don is also on the Board of Directors for the BV Centre for Research, (Centre of Excellence). See www.bvcentre.ca
7. Tear down the Silos, Power Towers, Empires, and Barriers, to conducting efficient and effective business. It seems as though there is too much playing with Alphabet Soup. (BCFIC, BIMG, PBIMAC, NRSIC, NRSIWG, VIAC, ILMB, LRDW)
8. How many Consortiums, Groups, Councils, Committees, Agencies, Branches, Bureaus, and Networks are required to manage a common set of data for the one common Provincial Crown Landbase?
9. Would it be possible to blend together (or Collaborate, Cooperate, Coordinate) at least the:
 - a) Provincial Base Mapping Advisory Committee (PBIMAC),
 - b) Natural Resource Sector Information Council (NRSIC),
 - c) Vegetation Inventory Advisory Council (VIAC)?

10. How can we expect to create a set of common:

Vision; Goals; Mandate; Roles and Responsibilities; Accountabilities, with so many conflicting interests and bureaucratic barriers? This lack of accountability and common purpose is likely why the BC Forest Industry Consortium (BCIFC) and the Business Information Management Group (BIMG) are no longer functioning.

11. There is the need to ensure adequate resources are allocated over time to ensure proper: Implementation, Training, Monitoring, Communications, Reporting, and Extension. The Adaptive Management and Continuous Improvement cycle would then assess the results of actions taken, and adapt the program as required.

Respondent #5

12. *Background # 4.* Should it be FIMW Challenges? It was my understanding that there were a number of data related concerns brought forward last year, each with their own challenge. Clarification may assist in providing an understanding as to how “forest information” and base mapping has become the focus of this dialogue.

13. *Background # 11.* Should be clear that unanimous agreement was among industry and government in attendance.

Respondent #6

14. Could add that the MoFR Streamlining Forest Information project identified improved info sharing as a key area of opportunity to streamline forest info management in the forest sector. Main page for project: <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/hfp/streamlining/index.htm>

Respondent #7

15. *Background # 5* does not mention that the only direct access to the LRDW is restricted to internal government staff. Item 6 should probably mention that the data exchange process and the preceding data for sale process offers opportunities to negotiate a new and more efficient blanket approach.

Respondent #8

16. Drop: the mandate and related collaborative efforts section – not relevant,

17. Drop: client access tool, GIS strategy – not relevant

18. Add: iTRIM background, goals and update,

19. Add: BMGS digital road atlas (DRA) as an example of a data sharing partnership,

20. Add: ESF -> RESULTS -> VRI as an existing data sharing arrangement

21. Add: ESF -> ABR -> TRIM as an existing data sharing arrangement

Respondent #9

22. Good enough. After reading the background I get the impression that these issues do not have enough impact to sustain effort. I don't agree with this statement, but it leaves that impression with me.

23. *Background #3.* BIMG was working with the issues and recommendations of the Forest Stewardship Working Group – Inventory and Information Management sub-group.

24. *Background # 5.* – The LRDW has recently evolved into the corporate . . . The LRDW is the repository for corporate data. All datasets have custodians (not clear on all of them) that manage the what, where and why of the data. If the LRDW is to truly gain support, it needs

to improve. The main opportunities with the LRDW are still existent today. The local data sharing partnerships currently address those issues for their areas.

25. *Background # 6.* I don't think we have hit the target with the last line in the first paragraph “. . . most efficient, economical and effective means possible.”?!?! BMGS may recognize an exchange program, but there are too many obstacles and costs in implementing it from a forest industry perspective. Imposed data standards and methodologies are too expensive to implement. There is a reason why companies are not lining up to participate. This whole concept really needs to be “challenged” during this process.
26. *Background # 7.* – Work to date has been okay. Caution needs to be exercised to not make these tools too functionally specific. This will reduce the use of the tools and the data
27. *Background # 12.* What broad industry representation?
28. *Background #12- #14* – A lot of groups doing a lot of things. Overlap? Isn't this challenge dialogue mimicking what some of the work the NRSIWG is doing?

Respondent #10

29. Submission of data by licensees via ESF is missing
30. There are currently many local, informal data sharing initiatives, among industry and between industry and “branch” government that are working well and serving a business purpose today.

Respondent #11

31. Appears to cover it well

Respondent #13

32. Looks fine.
33. There seems to be a precedent for groups being formed, then dissolved only to be formed again. To get full industry support for the FIMW we need to be confident that this new group will receive support and not be dissolved before achieving it's goals.
34. The data sharing business models are good. FTA, ABR and RESULTS should be added since they cover industry/government “data sharing”. These submissions cover the bulk of the data that industry produces and the data is used to update provincial datasets (TRIM, VRI).

Respondent #15

35. Background statements are relevant
36. Background statements are complete – exception might be associations such as COFI, CFPA and ILMB – which may have information committees or working groups that might be relevant to this discussion

Respondent #16

37. *Background Statements 1 – 4* collaborative efforts - I still don't think we've effectively worked this part out, hence the collapse of the Consortium and then BIMG. And this type of workshop doesn't necessary fill the potential gap.

Respondent #17

38. Close enough for initial

Respondent #18

39. Stating the LRDW vision is fine but really what is important is the LRDW reality. What is the gap between the vision and the implementation?
40. Re TRIM: discussion of currency. Is currency an impediment to sharing or an impediment to usefulness? We must keep the issues separated. At the end of the day we may be able to make some statements about data content and quality standards but we should not be identifying them as data exchange issues.
41. These background statements highlight the duplication and overlap of access mechanisms and emphasizes the need to know who is using the data, how they are using it and what type of access do they require and that leads to some strategy for rationalizing access mechanisms.

Respondent #19

42. *Background Statement 10* – KDSP – peer to peer relationship with the LRDW is unclear. Is there another warehouse here? Is the data also accessible via the LRDW?
43. *Background Statements 7&8* – CAT and GIS Strategies – why are these projects listed as data sharing models?

Respondent #21

44. No, the information is quite clear

Respondent #32

45. Background statements are clear. Additionally, there should be some education around what the “bumps and warts” are for the various datasets. This would extend past metadata records and include documentation and training on such topics as ownership (what is it and what does it mean), land research and status, administrative boundaries (how are they managed – why can’t you just change the lines) etc. For example, determining ownership is a process and not just a data layer or GIS query. There should also be some understanding around the fact that not all information exists in a digital format and why/when one would need to access the non-digital data etc. Additionally, what each digital system/application (MapView, I-Map, ILRR, GATOR etc) does and what it could be used for in a business context would also be useful.

Respondent #33

46. What is the situation around resourcing and long-term support?
47. The LRDW needs to be the foundation that the data sharing tool draws upon. We should not have competing data repositories.
48. If the data was all there and clean in a single repository then we could move quickly to the analysis.

Input Request #3 — Expected Outcomes

■ Please review the Expectations and provide your responses in writing in the accompanying Feedback Form.

What expected outcomes do you have for this Challenge Dialogue (as in...”I would consider this Dialogue a success if...”)?

Respondent #1

1. I am less excited about yet another well-crafted vision statement and more likely to put some energy into Principles and Priority Actions.

Respondent #2

2. Success to me means current and accurate data in base mapping, forest vegetation and other inventories and associated products (e.g., imagery) are available in 6 months and maintained with updates twice a year.

Respondent #4

3. High quality data shared among stakeholders, making the information reliable and accurate for decision-making.
4. A consensus on security and privacy around data sharing

Respondent #5

5. We achieve input and commitment from among the participants that will allow the organizing team to move forward with the presentation of a strategy and action plan to FIMW 2007 that does represent a spectrum.

Respondent #7

6. I would consider this Dialogue a success if we end up with a high level agreement on a broad based master agreement that opens all data up to all industry players with an acceptable commitment to provide two way data sharing with minimal data use restrictions. A provincial veg inventory with holes for the TFL's is much less valuable than a single seamless public inventory.

Respondent #8

7. Many people were interested and responded to it.

Respondent #9

8. All four points in the document were addressed keeping cost front and center.

Respondent #10

9. If government shows/demonstrates a willingness to engage licensees as equal stakeholders/partners.
10. If “next steps” are incremental, achievable and are designed to demonstrate the value of data sharing to all stakeholders.

Respondent #11

11. Bullets 1-4 was accomplished at this meeting and there is agreement to hire a project manager who everyone agrees to completely focus on this. Status reports should go out to the group periodically and feed back is required for decision making throughout the project.

Respondent #13

12. I would consider this dialogue a success if I can easily fulfill my data exchange requirements through existing exchange mechanisms (FTA, RESULTS, ABR) without have to do duplicate submissions of certain data types. From a data acquisition standpoint a provincial model similar to the Kootenay Spatial Data Partnership (<http://www.kootenayspatial.ca/xsql/ksdpmenu01.xsql>) would be a great success. It is very convenient for checking for recently updated layers and it is a “one stop shop” for data.

Respondent #14

13. A clear, concise document outlining the group’s feeling towards this issue.

Respondent #15

14. It helps identify the key roadblocks to effective information sharing between government and industry

15. It helps identify how industry and government need to work together to address those key roadblocks

16. A set of actions from the workshop to undertake the work identified above

Respondent #16

17. Participants were able to clearly *understand the top issues* that both government and industry is facing regarding – *data-sharing*. Lets keep this within scope!

Respondent #17

18. “Data Sharing” as pointed out early data without support can lead to misunderstandings.

Respondent #18

19. The common ground around the problem statement and scope can be identified and the outliers can be identified so that they may be discussed and dealt with.

Respondent #19

20. Custodianship of data in question is agreed to and process for handling data updates well defined within the Data Sharing Framework

Respondent #20

21. Clear agreement on issues/ hurdles and that we have group collaboration to resolve.

Respondent #21

22. I would like to see a concise document outlining the points of agreement among the participants with a clear set of action items that will be acted on over the next 6 months to one year

Respondent #32

23. We collectively achieved a greater understanding and appreciation of the needs of industry and government and identified the opportunities for mutual collaboration and benefit.

What expectations do you have for the face-to-face workshop (as in..."I would consider the workshop a success if...")?**Respondent #1**

24. The concept and role of Data Custodianship is important in government, to ensure accountability and reduce wheel-spinning during issue resolution. I would consider the workshop a success if we could confirm there is no similar role in industry, and define thoroughly but at a high level what the government Data Custodian role means, or should mean, to industry and its players.

Respondent #2

25. Fair representation of user groups. Clarify the scope: does this include the forest industry and government, or is it a larger group?

26. Again, I need a clear understanding of the business drivers (business maps would help)

27. How far are 'we' willing to go with a change to our existing data mgt model?

Respondent #4

28. Crafted the challenge paper better defined and with a solid operational foundation or process

29. Mandate, vision and mission statements as if an organization is formally established.

30. A website to facilitate discussion and to communicate continuously the shared vision

Respondent #5

31. Participants have a clear understanding of scope and expected outcomes at the beginning of the session to remain focused while being engaged in true collaboration on the components of the framework.

32. Some concern around the "seeking alignment" wording and how this will be facilitated.

Respondent #7

33. All players come to the table with an open mind and a willingness to compromise long held positions.

Respondent #8

34. Relationships / connections are formed which mean that an improved consultation process happens between data custodians and stewards and data users. processes build relationships so that they can appreciate and better understand the issues faced.

35. Data providers listen carefully to feedback from data users and make changes to business processes that improve the utility, access, accuracy, timeliness of data.

36. Data providers improve their understanding of data applications.

37. Infrastructure providers (those with responsibility for LRDW, ILRR, DISCOVERY,) have a better appreciation of their role in data sharing

38. Clients for data have a better appreciation of the challenges that data and infrastructure maintainers face.

Respondent #9

39. See comment above.

Respondent #10

- 40. Same as above.
- 41. Good representation from all stakeholders.

Respondent #11

- 42. Everyone focus on the bigger picture, develop cooperation and make sincere effort ,make this a priority and not look at it only as “What is in it for me”

Respondent #13

- 43. There is a good representation from all impacted parties.
- 44. Everyone comes prepared with the information that is required at the workshop.

Respondent #14

- 45. A clear action plan with solid deliverables. A commitment from all participants to make this a priority to commit the required resources to see this through.

Respondent #15

- 46. A lot of group work on issues

Respondent #16

- 47. Both sides had an opportunity to inform each other of the challenges associated with the top issues. All parties were able to contribute to the potential solutions and some potential closure. Also, as a branch director, I can not afford to have follow-up task groups continue to work on issues. We already have many under VIAC (with industry), NRSIC, etc

Respondent #17

- 48. Set simple realistic goals with an achievable time.

Respondent #18

- 49. The vision and principles for a data sharing framework are established

Respondent #20

- 50. At the conclusion of our face to face, we have been successful if...we have identified clear roles and responsibilities (ownership) all roadblocks and identified actions with key milestone dates.

Respondent #21

- 51. I would like to hear and better understand the real and or perceived impediments to data sharing that exist among the various participants

Respondent #32

- 52. While there are many challenges to overcome with regard to data access and sharing, there should also be recognition that the issues go beyond that to include knowledge sharing as well. Just getting access to the data will not make life easier. One needs to understand what the data really is and is not and what it can be best used for.

What suggestions do you have to make the workshop most effective?**Respondent #1**

53. I'll have to go through the CDS process first before offering suggestions.

Respondent #2

54. Task the existing FIMW working groups with specific actions to follow up on (narrow their focus with some specific timelines)

55. Communication – how do 'we' plan to engage users and keep them engaged? What does effective communication look like?

Respondent #4

56. Project manager or core people who can share their experience in corporate data sharing, integration, data mining, information/business intelligence and system architect for multi organizations.

57. Look at other issues that will help data/information sharing, such as organization structure, policy and procedures, culture, system development and design method, business analysis that can help data sharing, etc.

Respondent #5

58. As indicated in responses to questions above.

Respondent #7

59. All players arrive with a mandate to commit their organizations to the outcome.

Respondent #10

60. Same as above.

Respondent #11

61. This is a good starting point.

Respondent #13

62. Get information out to the participants early enough that they can show up prepared.

Respondent #14

63. Provide a strong facilitator who makes sure we do not go off on tangents, especially when private industry and government may have different views.

Respondent #15

64. A lot of group work on issues with effective facilitation to make sure we close on key issues with actions.

Respondent #16

65. Need lots of opportunities for questions and answers. I cannot afford to have follow-up task groups work on follow-up issues. I have too many already under VIAC (with industry), NRSIC, etc

Respondent #18

- 66. Based on the input from the dialogue, use a straw man approach to promote discussion
- 67. Seek consensus but limit discussion if none to be found (parking lot approach)

Respondent #19

- 68. Focus on what is working well and look for opportunities to leverage in other areas, striving for continuous improvement

Respondent #20

- 69. Each individual must leave his or her hat at the door.
- 70. The group must work together for the common cause.

Respondent #21

- 71. I would like to see the facilitator(s) keep the discussion on track to make good use of the time available

Respondent #32

- 72. The fact that we are having this workshop and getting together to collectively and collaboratively discuss the issues, in my book, makes the exercise a success right off the bat. If we can throw the snakes on the table and look at them openly, honestly and in an atmosphere of mutual respect to achieve some clear commitment and direction towards a workable common framework of data and knowledge sharing, we would be well on our way to achieving success.

Input Request #4 — Assumptions

- Please review the Assumption Statements and provide your responses in writing in the accompanying Feedback Form. Please refer to the Assumption Statement numbers when appropriate.

Which assumptions require more clarification for you to understand?

Respondent #1

1. *Assumption #9*. What does the ('2') mean?

Respondent #2

2. *Assumption #5c*: Does this imply data from other sources/activities (e.g., oil & gas)?
3. *Assumption #5d*: Does this imply development activities within tenures?

Respondent #5

4. *Assumption # 19* It may be beneficial to understand the reference to roadblocks (what is an example of a roadblock at this time) so that we do not get side tracked on these issues at this time. Though it does need to be determined how they will be dealt with in the action plan.

Respondent #7

5. Seem fine.

Respondent #9

6. *Assumption #1*: What happened to #1 in the list. My document starts at 2.
7. *Assumption #2* can be taken out of context. It needs to consider cost. Same comment for #3.
8. *Assumption #4*. The LRDW needs work!
9. *Assumption #5.c.* – Includes streams and roads.
10. *Assumption #14*. Get rid of data exchange agreements that are too onerous and costly to implement. Industry bears the majority of the cost and less of the benefit.
11. *Assumption #15*. Yes – Add some standards are too high.
12. *Assumption #18*. Need help understanding the last 2 sentences.
13. *Assumption #19- #21*. - Agree

Respondent #10

14. *Assumption #2* - I don't believe everyone is convinced about "great potential"...I believe there is interest but also much skepticism
15. *Assumption #5* – should include data maintained and owned by industry
16. *Assumption #13* – unsure what that is saying?
17. *Assumption #14* – Not true...DEA's are outdated in light of ESF, offer little value to either industry or government
18. *Assumption #16* – I would use the word "potential" as opposed to the word "general"; other business benefits need to be defined....not just data related benefits

19. Assumption #23 – progress must allow for small steps that demonstrate value...then re-assess the framework...then more small steps

Respondent #11

20. Appear to be OK

Respondent #15

21. Having been involved in drafting the assumptions they all make pretty good sense to me

Respondent #18

22. Assumption #4 – part of the problem or part of the solution?
23. Assumption #5(d) discusses private land parcels (where available) so is data sharing about best available or about meeting business needs?
24. Assumption #9, and Assumption #11 seems to address similar if not the same aspect but they seem to wander without saying anything conclusive
25. Assumption #13 raises the pricing policy question. Is this the fundamental sticking point? Separate the nature of the issues.

Respondent #19

26. Assumption #22 – What is VIAC?
27. NWDSN, KDSP should not be competing with LRDW but complimenting
28. Assumption #23 – last paragraph – improving the LRDW content and access services

Respondent #21

29. Assumption #13- I would like to have clarification around assumption 13 – ‘Collaboration hampered by perceived high cost of data’
30. Assumption #18 - I would like to have additional information re assumption 18 – ‘DEAs require a lot of effort to establish and are too restrictive’. I would like to understand this process better to see if there are ways to streamline

Respondent #28

31. Assumptions 7-10 need to be well articulated within a business case or else the initiative will flop. We don't sell data.

Respondent #32

32. Assumptions as stated are clear to me

Do you strongly disagree with any of these assumptions?

Respondent #1

No, merely commenting:

33. *Assumption #13* I would see this more as quid pro quo, and if we can trade access for better, more up-to-date quality data, that ends up being a shared cost of data management, and worthwhile

34. *Assumption #14* The least intrusive, least bureaucratic method of using DEAs should be rigorously pursued
35. *Assumption #16* Also leads to more provable decisions
36. *Assumption #17* More on action, less on a well-crafted vision statement.
37. *Assumption #18* Vigorously pursue those ideas that reduce bureaucracy.
38. *Assumption #22* Add in the Standards parentheses: “Full Corporate / Local Corporate data,”.

Respondent #2

39. *Assumption #8* seems to contradict item 6 in terms of focus

Respondent #6

40. Don't need 9, 10, 14 and 21

Respondent #8

41. *Assumption #2*. I doubt everyone agrees data sharing holds great potential for all.
42. *Assumption #14* . DEAs – I don't believe they have created a co-operative model – and I don't believe they create the right environment for current, complete and timely data.
43. *Assumption #21*. data sharing may not result in an equitable set of dealings.

Respondent #9

44. We need to confirm understanding around existing data sharing agreements and the effectiveness of the LRDW.

Respondent #10

45. *Assumption #14*
46. *Assumption #18*. ...the concept may be ok but probably needs to be reborn as a “new deal” ...the starting point for a broader notion of data exchange/sharing

Respondent #13

47. *Assumption #13* – “free” access to data. With my DEA I download my TRIM once. I am now on the hook for the rest of my life submitting updates through a cumbersome process that is duplicated through other mandatory processes (FTA, RESULTS).
48. *Assumption #17* – DEA's do not create a sharing environment. One of the main reasons for having a DEA is to acquire TRIM. Once TRIM data is processed to be able to use it operationally you can never replace a tile due to the addition and collection of many attributes needed at an operational level.

Respondent #14

49. I do not agree that DEAs are a requirement any longer. With requirements for ESF, industry is submitting data outside of the DEA, resulting in duplication of efforts as we are still required to submit to LRDW.

Respondent #15

50. *Assumptions #8 and 9 and 10 and 11*– Don't disagree that some business value will be different, but we also need to focus on those business values that are the same or similar – they may make for more incentive, reason and opportunity to work together on those fronts than where there are major differences.
51. *Assumption #13*– Irrespective of the view as to who pays the critical need is to ensure people understand there is no such thing as free data – someone needs to pay for data capture, maintenance and improvement or the quality and currency of our datasets will erode over time. The costs need to be addressed in sustainable fashion – likely involving a shared cost model across the producer/user community
52. *Assumption #14* – lets never use the term “free data” any more – someone needs to pay for it – some people may get “open” access to it, but someone has covered the cost associated with that “open” access – many times it is the taxpayer
53. *Assumption #19* – technology or electronic submission is likely a key factor in resolving much of the data sharing barriers and DEA issues.

Respondent #17

54. None, but some need to be clarified and explained in what is trying to be accomplished

Respondent #18

55. *Assumption #2* is probably an over simplification. Data sharing will place demands on some custodians and those demands might outweigh the direct benefits they receive although the benefits realized by the community will be great.
56. *Assumption #5* TRIM Mapsheets or topographic mapping information?
57. *Assumption #16* only if the scope of sharing is defined to include data content, currency and quality standards. The exchange of best available data does not really accomplish all of those goals
58. *Assumption #18* requires a clear definition of the purpose behind data exchange agreements – licensing, sales agreement, are they intended to restrict data use or permit data use
59. *Assumption #23* be careful to clearly define the scope of the framework to include all of the issues that may be seen as impediments.

Respondent #19

60. *Assumption #5* – data scope good place to start but likely needs to broaden to include more data sets
61. *Assumption #22* – key word is leverage – assumption should focus on leveraging LRDW as much as possible

Respondent #31

62. *Assumption #6*: Hard to imagine forest companies sharing data with ENGO's, realistically.
63. *Assumption #16*: Lower Cost - maybe, More consistent – definitely not
64. *Assumption #19*: Probably not. Sharing will occur at lowest level (ie. FTP site)

65. Assumption # 22: Technology exercises . Technology is important.

What assumptions, if any, would you add to the list?

Respondent #2

66. *Assumption #9*: Please elaborate on this – business drivers need to be identified, and preferably business processes mapped to realize where alignment occurs or can occur.
67. *Assumption #14*: If data exchange is to be effective, it needs to be modeled after a functional example (e.g., NWDS?)

Respondent #5

68. At this time, I would not add further assumptions.

Respondent #7

69. Possible something along the lines of The value of a shared data repository is greater than the sum of the parts.

Respondent #8

70. Data sharing may mean many good things but it also means it comes with a cost in the form of compromises (not everyone gets what they want when they want it).
71. Managing changes to data is one of the most important, and difficult challenges to tackle in data sharing.
72. The second most important challenge is arranging / managing the governance of data – that is setting the rules and priorities.
73. Doing data sharing means doing extra communication – if your not working with others you don't have to coordinate what you are doing with them – but I you are reliant on others as you are in data sharing arrangements - you have to understand the data, the roles, agree on definitions, standards, methods, timing etc.
74. If you have the resources – it is usually easier to get what you want by doing it yourself – sharing takes time, effort, communication, consensus and COMPROMISE.

Respondent #10

75. Stakeholders should not count on making money by selling data to other stakeholders....if that concept is considered then perhaps an “outsource” scenario would be the most efficient means to provide service.

Respondent #14

76. All participants will work to break down all barriers to sharing data, and not hold any “sacred cows” if they do not make sense.

Respondent #15

77. List looks good.

Respondent #18

78. The data in question is owned by the public and subject to privacy constraints should be readily (not necessarily freely) available to the public

Respondent #19

79. The importance of data governance and recognition of the roles and accountabilities for both Data Custodians and Data Users cannot be emphasized enough (bullet 20).

Respondent #20

80. Must have agreement that there is room for improvement with the current structure of data sharing and that no one group has it 100% correct.

Respondent #32

81. Knowledge transfer is a key component of data sharing. There needs to be a common understanding of what a particular dataset is and is not, how it was compiled, maintained and what it can/should be used for. This extends beyond a metadata description to use and application in a business context.

Input Request #5 — Initial Ideas and Questions to Stimulate the Dialogue

- Please review the Framework and provide your responses to the 10 questions on page 17 and 18. (repeated here for convenience).

What are some of the features of the Vision statement that you would like to see?

Respondent #2

1. Readily available data and products, current (6 months), accurate, <1 m resolution; comprehensive in scope; both landscape level and stand/operational level

Respondent #4

2. The ability to provide best information at the time for decision-making.

Respondent #5

3. Indicate collaboration and commitment, consideration of added value for all gained from data sharing.

Respondent #9

4. No Cost.

Respondent #12

5. The vision must represent the desired future state and should be consistent with all participatory agencies individual corporate visions.

Respondent #13

6. Mutually beneficial data exchange using existing exchange mechanisms if available.

Respondent #14

7. Current data, free access, reliable

Respondent #15

8. An authoritative source for all data to be shared

Respondent #16

9. I still think most are thinking about free access to data, not necessarily sharing, which involving both parties contributing something.
10. On another note, I'd like to see Tree Farm Licenses share their data. At present, none of the TFL data in on LRDW. This represents about 20% of BC THLB and a huge chunk of the coast. So it will be very interesting to see how TFL holders buy into this vision.

Respondent #17

11. Good enough for first pass

Respondent #18

12. Clarity, focus, specificity, challenging, measurable. The example provided is vague and indeterminate I would prefer to cut it off after Full and open.

Respondent #19

13. Must also reference updates
14. Document seems focused at data being supplied to industry and not enough emphasis on 2 way exchange.

Respondent #20

15. Full sharing of all information

Respondent #21

16. Fully open, timely and cost effective access to forestry related data

Respondent #22

17. Well done

Respondent #23

18. A reasonable statement. Complicated to deliver at lower levels (operational). Execution has hurdles. Government and Industry sources and compensation mechanisms (operational issue).
19. Quality of management / administration of Data and Data Standards
20. Need to be comfortable that it is full and open sharing

Respondent #24

21. Value Proposition: when people talk value are they confusing between data and the use of data. If we focus too much on the intended use of data then it is too much focus on data component not the intended purposes
22. Accessible and cheap is not the solution: it is the start not the end

Respondent #25

23. The aspect of Forestry-related data: not limited to forestry. Forestry-related may convey an untrue perspective. There are other users of this information and we may be selling ourselves short.

Respondent #27

24. Good encompassing statement
25. Minimal cost and time delay
26. "Full and Open" – scale and scope of this phrase: A fair number of layers that could be included. A core set of data or many layers outside of the core level.

Respondent #28

27. Agree with the Vision
28. Like “Open Sharing”
29. Goalposts are quite broad so we need to manage expectations
30. Pragmatically, it has conflicting goals with min/min/max. (i.e. people buy into the “sharing” but don’t provide the resources
31. The Vision is too wide and not achievable in the short term. Maybe achievable in 25 years.
32. Currently, implementing the vision will be impaired by the lack of a “two way street”

Respondent #29

33. Process is basically broken and if the vision isn’t implemented it will get ugly fast.

Respondent #30

34. A general motherhood kind of statement. Most of this is fine. What comes after is what counts. Need to get to the meat.
35. Been involved with a few of these initiatives in the past. Trouble is that these things kind of unravel

Respondent #33

36. Like many other Vision Statements it looks fine in the context of the Challenge Dialogue.
37. The Vision might benefit from having a clearer outline of DEA expectations between industry and government.
38. You might be expecting a broader scope as the vision doesn’t set the context for the DEA

Respondent #34

39. Generally Okay with it.
40. It speaks of “Full and Open Sharing”. This needs to recognize that some data is not appropriate to share and also with whom the data gets shared.

Respondent #35

41. Captures what everyone is striving to do.

What are some of the core Guiding Principles that you think this group should be considering to help us operate?

Respondent #1

42. Initial suggestions to think about:
 - *From the GCIO’s Data Administration Forum’s [Terms of Reference](#): **Data and information are the essential linkages between an organization [the people] and its systems.** The habit of managing data properly acts to unify systems development and business improvement activities, and reduces costs. The connection and similarity of data*

- requirements across business areas must always be considered whenever business and system improvements or changes are planned.
- **Ditto: Data is a corporate resource that needs to be managed as an asset.** Big-picture thinking about data will need to be injected into virtually all changes and improvements.
 - **Ditto: Data needs to be managed across its entire life cycle.** Data quality can only be achieved when it is integral to all aspects of the data management life cycle. This will require clear definitions, and implementation of accountabilities, processes, roles and responsibilities for data, beginning with planning.
 - **Ditto: Data can be, and where possible should be, shared.** The usefulness of data depends on the underlying form of the data, the original purpose for the data, and the degree of confidence that the data are representative of real world phenomena. The value of data increases with the extent that data is shared.

Respondent #2

43. Commitment to participate; contribute; support

Respondent #3

44. Free the Data - The government has to date considered data as a source of revenue to the crown. This has in turn resulted in inefficiencies in conducting business and black-market trading arrangements to avoid payments. Much of the data has been paid for through the Forest Investment Account (FIA), which is then billed back to the users by government agencies. A central database should be universally available on web at no costs to the end user.
45. Be Inclusive - Do not limit these current discussions to only the Forest Industry, nor only to Forest related Information. There is already a huge demand for spatial data from the Mining Industry, NGOs, and the Natural Resource Consulting Community. These organizations cannot wait, as even this FIMW process will only create a DRAFT Strategic Plan Report Plan by Mid-November 2007. Including even limited representation from these organizations could provide needed insight, and perhaps innovative solutions at the initial stage of this Framework development.
46. Clearly Defined Roles, Responsibilities and One Ministry - MOAL; ILMB; MOFR; MOE; The Vision, Mandate, Roles, Responsibilities, and interactions among and between the above agencies, as they relate to inventory and Data Management, need to be clearly defined and documented. I realize this is outside of the Mandate of this exercise but as there is only One Landbase. (All Crown Lands), with One Set of Key Public Values to be Managed, there is a need to create One Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), with One Minister accountable. Combine the ministries of MOAL (ILBM); MOFR; MEMP, MOE; into One Ministry, call it the (MNR). Models for this structure exists in Alberta, Ontario Quebec, and New Brunswick. The costs associated by doing so, could be off-set through synergies created and by moving BCTS to a crown corporation (such as BC Hydro), to act more as a licensee, with separate offices from the MOFR. These moves should avoid inter-agency struggles and confusion, as to who looks after what, when, why and how.

Respondent #4

47. Accountability – members/stakeholders’ commitment in custodianship of their data. People can provide highest quality data and information to Forest information sharing. i.e. accuracy, relevance, timeliness, all the data quality criteria.

Respondent #5

- 48. Time
- 49. Consideration of value
- 50. Individual requirements/business cases
- 51. Continuous improvement- key indicator
- 52. Reasonable Cost with respect to value gained.
- 53. Process and accountability

Respondent #7

- 54. To succeed, I suspect all parties will have to come to the table willing to give more than they think they will receive. In the long run, I suspect the reverse will be true but that will have to be a leap of faith.

Respondent #8

- 55. Open to doing things different

Respondent #12

- 56. Common standards, Custodianship, Client/user focus, Multi-participant, Working towards free and open sharing of data.

Respondent #13

- 57. Data exchange should be easy!

Respondent #15

- 58. Standards should reflect business needs vs discipline needs
- 59. Shared ownership of information resource (both in terms of benefits and costs)
- 60. Collect information at source and provide to government once
- 61. Succeed together, or fail individually
- 62. Current investments should focus on future savings

Respondent #16

- 63. They should be well grounded, ie within reach.

Respondent #17

- 64. That fine.

Respondent #18

- 65. clarity of objectives
- 66. focus on outcomes,
- 67. standards based,
- 68. best practices based but process independent
- 69. commitment to the process and the outcome
- 70. consensus desired but not required

Respondent #19

- 71. LRDW principle repository

72. Corporate LRDW Services to be used as much as possible

73. Data Custodianship principles to be adopted

Respondent #20

74. Collaboration

75. Goal setting

76. Accountability

Respondent #21

77. We should establish a transparent framework for data sharing that respects the business requirements and relative value of all the participants

Respondent #22

78. Some of the framework requires building business dependencies on other organizations. We need management and performance principles. Organizations need to “sign on” the provision/management of data.

Respondent #24

79. What level for the Guiding Principles? If accountability to standards, how it will be done (having, publishing, monitoring of standards)? – critical for data components.

Respondent #28

80. Principles are good

81. We need Guiding Principles that are affirmed collectively.

82. “Public Domain” information should be publically available. Data about “how much” and “where” should be considered public information.

83. How you use the data and any value-added analysis models are not public.

Respondent #29

84. Respect that different business processes are in place amongst the different licensees.

85. On the flip side, people want to use the information with as little interpretation as possible yet companies are jammed into a common template for submissions.

86. If there are problems with the information then this leads to skepticism and weakness in analysis

Respondent #30

87. That all of this work somehow leads to the enhancement of resource management

88. Moves toward a common mapbase.

Respondent #31

89. All members need a shared sense of trust

90. Why don't I trust people to have my data? Do I get value? What are the risks?

91. Maximum Access / Reciprocity

Respondent #33

92. Commitment – “in for a penny, in for a pound”; to meet the written terms if any future agreements around data sharing.

93. Equality – everyone is on the same footing.
94. Recognition of resourcing realities.
95. A corporate authority that is sponsoring / supporting the initiative (above the Director level).

Respondent #34

96. Any data that is shared needs to add value to the participants.
97. Submit data once and be cost effective
98. Reasonable standards

Respondent #35

99. Communication: ongoing need with government; gov't staff don't know about all the various initiatives and shared mandates (e.g. ILMB, Ecosystems, Water Stewardship); many tasks are shared and lines are blurred.

What are some existing Governance and Oversight Groups that potentially could work together to provide the Governance and Oversight Role (e.g. PBMAC – Provincial Base Mapping Advisory Committee; VIAC - the Vegetation Inventory Advisory Council; NRSIC Natural Resources Sector Information Council)? Do you have any other thoughts that might be helpful at fleshing out the governance and oversight component?

Respondent #1

100. N/A

Respondent #2

101. Advisory groups need to be relevant to the issue. May need an over-arching steering committee that relies on support/contribution from many working groups. Need a clear TOR and team charter.

Respondent #5

102. Part of the challenge should be to identify and fully understand all of the groups that may be involved or have some overlap, clarify those linkages and then roles and responsibilities for FIMW can be determined. From there collaborations can be sought for oversight role and commitments related to governance.

Respondent #7

103. I don't see this as particularly important. If we have a meeting of the minds, any or all of the vehicles will serve. If we fail to close the gap no governing body will help.

Respondent #8

104. I believe the NRSIC/NRSIWG group with some sort of private sector advisory group could provide the governance and oversight roles.

Respondent #9

105. How can we add the CIO Forum?

Respondent #10

- 106. PBMAC....not (forestry) business oriented...not appropriate
- 107. NRSIC.....government only
- 108. VIAC....current focus is inventory

Respondent #12

- 109. NRSIC, KSDP, NWDSN
- 110. Larry Price was working on a concept paper last year about how the incorporate KSDP model into the ILMB/NRSIC model.

Respondent #15

- 111. Current governance model works good within government, need stronger joint governance between government and industry and industry needs a better governing focal point (i.e. a provincial association with decision making authority)

Respondent #16

- 112. There are many layers to the issues. First I'm not sure that within government we have our business well in order so it's difficult to widely include industry in working together on big corporate solutions.
- 113. PBMAC and NRSIC are not forums for problem-solving, mostly just to download information.
- 114. VIAC, for now is a small functioning body with specific tasks.
- 115. My question is more to industry, what would they like to see?

Respondent #17

- 116. That fine.

Respondent #18

- 117. Whoever has the most vested in the successful outcome – NRSIC seems like the most likely group

Respondent #19

- 118. NRSIWG can also be leveraged

Respondent #22

- 119. Integrated Cadastral Information Society

Respondent #23

- 120. From Industry perspective: Policy and Administration aspects need to be covered but also operational aspects – vendors that provide solutions.
- 121. An Industry group is lacking – different vendors and a challenge with adopting “Open Standards”

Respondent #27

- 122. Lots of times you don't know who is doing what.

Respondent #28

- 123. FIA is not a G&O entity for data sharing and should be removed from the text.
- 124. Need a definition of governance.
- 125. Currently, governance mechanisms only exist within the VIAC.
- 126. Data follows a custodial rule and a Stewardship Rule
- 127. There isn't an organization that "governs" data. Each organization identifies it's custodial role: the data ethic needs to be established.

Respondent #29

- 128. Voice of the custodian and voice of the user needs to be represented

Respondent #30

- 129. All are linked. One supports the other.

Respondent #31

- 130. ICIS – Integrated Cadastral Information Society. A similar structure to the FIMW. One technical staff and member access to an enhances FTP site

Respondent #34

- 131. May be too many players – makes it confusing.

Do you have any concerns or comments you would like to make about the intent of the Strategic Framework?

Respondent #2

- 132. Communication and organizational relationships must be addressed as critical elements for success of this initiative.

Respondent #6

- 133. No, it looks really sound.

Respondent #10

- 134. It seems that we are talking "around" the whole issues of data sharing rather than what specific applications of data sharing would provide mutual benefit with a minimum of fuss and bother.

Respondent #11

- 135. Just that is it good on paper. Need strong commitment and resourcing.

Respondent #12

- 136. What is the goal or objectives for this group and what is mandate?
- 137. If data access for Licensees is the objective then let's just say it and work towards it.
- 138. BMGS will not change their position on data access so let's just work around that.

Respondent #15

139. A strategic framework within which to frame issues, goals and actions is a good thing.

Respondent #16

140. Given we only have one day for the workshop, I'd really like us to focus on the 6 elements of data-sharing. We could easily spend the day talking about vision and principles and not even get near the key elements, which I think look the most relevant for this exercise.

Respondent #17

141. Good enough for 1st pass.

Respondent #18

142. I am not sure that the value proposition is a data sharing element. It seems to me that this should be up around vision and principles and it seems to me that the value proposition would contain some discussion of risks and consequences

143. Likewise continuous improvement of the framework would be a governance model or possibly a Data Management Systems issue and continuous improvement of the information would be an operational matter driven in part by the demands of the data sharing community

144. It is not clear whether Data Management Systems relates to the systems associated with data sharing or whether they are the operational systems associated with the content and quality of the data to be shared. Assumptions 15 and 16 refer to data content, quality and currency that might indicate operational data management systems would be drawn into this area. I am not sure that is what is intended.

Respondent #22

145. Discussion on the business value of moving forward. One thing missing is a discussion on Operational Value (e.g. Ecological –based Management – a perfect example of a situation where PPP data sharing is critical for this concept to work). What does this mean at the operational level? The value proposition: Communication to the operations level is problematic. DEA's stop at the operational level. Need to explain the Value Proposition and the benefits to daily tasks.

Respondent #23

146. If you look at external influences, there is a move toward making more data publically available.

147. Development/implementation of Standards is a problem

Respondent #29

148. Fine, as long as we act on it.

Respondent #31

149. Pretty descriptive around a couple of levels

150. Who's line of business will include making it work?

151. Funding: Once the deciders decide, who are the enablers? Sharing has to be someone's business.

Respondent #33

- 152. A good idea regarding efficiencies, etc.
- 153. Has most of the key elements
- 154. A constrained scope can be good or bad.
- 155. Commitment to resources is key.
- 156. A challenge: the balance between flexibility in how you work and sloppy work.

Respondent #35

- 157. Understand and share the intent
- 158. Getting the same data requests from year to year.
- 159. It would be good to have “standard views” assembled in a process or system with “one stop shop” access to the info
- 160. A single, authoritative source.
- 161. This initiative should decide what is the source (LRDW website, ftp, other).

There are seven components to the Framework with the Data Sharing Component comprising six elements. Are any major components missing or are there any that are not relevant and should be removed?

Respondent #4

- 162. Data quality standards
- 163. Security and privacy

Respondent #5

- 164. No major relevant components missing at this time.

Respondent #11

- 165. Looks good.

Respondent #12

- 166. What is this? Where is the relevance to data sharing?

Respondent #15

- 167. The framework looks complete – will need to test with some real business issues using “use cases” to confirm completeness and robustness of model. We might ask what do we need to do to ensure information is collected at source, we have an authoritative source for data, how do we address user updates to databases, etc

Respondent #18

- 168. I think everything that is there is OK. As above I am not sure it is all in the right place and as per earlier comments clarity and specificity on the scope and depth of the this framework is necessary.

Respondent #19

169. Standard notification mechanisms need to be put into place regarding data currency/quality improvements and common protocols for handling data updates.

Respondent #20

170. Everything looks complete.

Respondent #21

171. One element that I don't see specifically mentioned is the formation of a technical committee comprised of members from a variety of participating organization. It would be beneficial for this group to assess current and emerging technology directions that could be adopted to improve the Data Sharing Framework.

172. Data quality standards.

Respondent #22

173. Don't remove any.

Respondent #23

174. In Roles & Responsibilities – need to describe Industry Role (“Open Standards” Boards

175. It would be good to see an Industry Board

176. RESULTS example: There needs to be a discussion of how to implement these standards.

177. Strategic direction needs to be operationalized.

Respondent #24

178. Value Proposition – people need to see value in what they are doing. If the focus is on data, then the positions should be relatively the same (if data is there, then there will be standards).

179. How you work with the data is unique and related to Information Management. Too much integration results in confusion (i.e. RESULTS updates and VRI updates.- rely on same data but totally different objectives.

Respondent #25

180. A key thing missing is the concept of moving beyond data into knowledge sharing. FIMW should realize the added value (The Value Proposition) and benefits.

181. Knowledge within the various warehouses from a consultant's perspective: we get data but after the value is added (knowledge), there is no way to give it back. There needs to be a mechanism for sharing value added data.

182. E.g. PEM or Habitat Modeling.

183. The Value of the existing data is not being evaluated on an “apples to apples” basis.

184. Strongly agree with the Change Management statement.

Respondent #26

185. Ownership of data – when can you sell maps or some of the data – need clarification?

Respondent #28

186. The “data ethic” has to be a business principle. This is key to successful digital data management.
187. There cannot be a casual approach to data quality, quantity.
188. If we are not focused on deliverables then it will continue to be garbage in/garbage out.

Respondent #29

189. It’s all in the roll-out and the doing.

Respondent #33

190. In the Governance, there should be a discussion on who can be a participant in the initiative. There are challenges between Provinces, Sectors, Parks. He scope should include a description of who participates.
191. The term of the Framework/Initiative. Renewal frequency of the partnership
192. Resources and commitment.

Respondent #35

193. Roles and Responsibilities: Include “Client Access” (a place for expert advice/opinion; provide judgment or interpretation of data that gets implemented through client access.

Is the detailed description of each component complete – what should be added or removed?

Respondent #5

194. f) Agree that Continuous Improvement is required, however, narrow down the umbrella and state that it is a **management process** that is required to carry out the monitoring part of this section, mapping of some business processes may help with the operating protocols.

Respondent #11

195. Looks good.

Respondent #15

196. Looks good.

Respondent #17

197. Good enough for initial pass, but clarification and word smith to clean up description is needed.

Respondent #18

198. The FIMW may provide input to the rationalization of tools and tools initiatives.

Respondent #19

199. Communications description too narrow
200. Change management/continuous improvement - process improved or content?
201. Governance/oversight – may require sector level agreement to streamline data sharing with Forest Sector

Respondent #21

202. Descriptions are complete. These could change or evolve through the course of the workshop.

Respondent #23

203. Covering the main elements. Need to describe relationship to industry - vendors / software providers

204. Need a specific reference to “enablers”.

Respondent #33

205. No topic areas missing

206. It provides a skinny skeleton of detail.

Focusing on the six (6) more detailed elements of the Data Sharing component, are there any elements missing or any that are not relevant and should be removed?

Respondent #1

207. N/A

Respondent #2

208. Perhaps recognition of existing tools/applications/info that can feed into the ‘what’ ...but that goes without saying...

Respondent #5

209. 4. a) worthwhile to all of our businesses (to continue with the recognition of different values)

210. 4. f) understand that we are purposely focusing on risks of not sharing data, therefore need to ensure positives other than lower costs are clear in a).

Respondent #11

211. Well covered.

Respondent #15

212. Looks good.

Respondent #17

213. Nothing major

Respondent #18

214. As above I am not sure that the value proposition, the risks and change management are consistent with the definition of data sharing

215. Operating Policy and Protocols – pricing should probably be included in this section

216. Data to be Shared – there should be clarity here on is the intention to share maps (i.e. pre-defined tiles of information) or map data?
217. Change Management and Continuous Improvement – it is not clear what change is under consideration – the framework or the continuous update and improvement of the subject datasets. The former is within the purview here, I suspect the latter is not directly

Respondent #20

218. No, I feel the elements stated have captured the most appropriate elements

Respondent #21

219. I'm not sure where this would fit – possibly in change management and continuous improvement, but I believe there could be some value in looking at how other groups (possibly non-forestry) structure data sharing governance and technology. Examples of this are the Integrated Cadastral Information Society (ICIS), Oil and Gas sector and Mining industry

Respondent #22

220. Why were “Data Management Systems” and “Client Access Tools” identified as Components and not additional Data Sharing Elements

Respondent #23

221. In general; If developing Policy/Process, scale back to focus on tangible example as a “Pilot Project” (e.g. VRI)
222. Concern is that “Data to be Shared” is the objective, use one database as a test base.

Respondent #25

223. Risk needs to be fleshed out more especially regarding ministries or organizations. Data is subject to change and we end up rebuilding the wheel. How do you keep it current beyond two election cycles?
224. Focus on Forestry over the next 5 years. Forestry revenue will be on a downward cycle with negative effects on Agencies and Ministries. Look at other organizations like NWDSN. We need to sustain the framework

Respondent #30

225. Value Proposition – relevant as an element

Respondent #31

226. “Data to be Shared” could apply to all elements.
227. Be careful to not exclude people who can't meet the requirements of one element or are underutilize the ones who can exceed all elements.

Respondent #33

- 228. Value Proposition and Risks are 2 sides of the same story.
- 229. Conditions for Use – Governance: Concerned about researchers using archived data without proper authority or citation
- 230. Concerns about potential misuse of information. The data gets used out of context with inaccurate assumptions.
- 231. How do you manage version control?

Respondent #34


- 232. There are risks to sharing data (i.e. proprietary nature of some data; if data is shared with ENGO's, it could be used for purposes other than originally intended.

Respondent #35

- 233. Want to see TEM/PEM reach a broader audience

Please insert your comments into the table below (the boxes will expand as required). For each of the six (6) elements of the Data Sharing component, please list (a) any Issues, Barriers, Challenges; (b) Opportunities; and (c) other comments.

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
The Value Proposition – general comments for this element (please see definition in next section)			
Forest Industry	R2: Proprietary info? R2: Understanding their primary motivation (may be different than that of other industry) R5: Getting past perceived risks when sharing data R7: Hard costs with less tangible benefits. R8: Highly values time of employees = real costs – may not want to take time to participate. R8: Competition – don't want to give up secrets, IP – concerned about privacy. R9: Cost, Standards, Managing change over time – ie. What do we do if data changes and our information differs and we have plans/approvals based on our data? Due Diligence defense may be suspect if data is continually changing. R11: Operational data requirements needs are challenging R13: Costs R15: The bottom line R18: Data quality R18: Interoperability standards R19: Supply of updates back R20: Quality updates R21: Confidentiality concerns re proprietary, sensitive data R21: Costs R21: Data quality/integrity R22: Understand the value of the Operations Level. R22: Less interested in "6 Elements" etc. at the Operations level R24: Need to separate "data" from "information management" R28: If values are "contrary" then there is an impediment. If it is in the	R7: More and better data at less cost than other approaches. R8: Good at minimizing costs – keeping things focused on what is needed. R9: Timing, completeness R11: Input operational information to corporate level R13: Up to date data R15: Area based management R18: Assess and articulate data and services needs R18: Establish or adopt industry interoperability standards R19: ESF and other data submission standard process frameworks R21: Access to rich data source and government infrastructure R22: Defining at the Operational level and communication are key to buy-in and implementation. R26: Having accurate data –	R14: Value can be measured in many ways other than simply \$\$\$ R15: Beetle and EBM will fundamentally change forest industry in this Province. R24: We aren't in the position to address the information management, just the data. Take data and move it into their world. People get confused and start to impose their standards R30: Anything to make the process easier is greatly welcomed. Anything to streamline the process is appreciated R31: Funding will be cut if it is a "nice to do"

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	<p>interest of one of the parties to not share information then this is a challenge. How do we overcome this?</p> <p>R29: Certain groups tend to forget that they have a "licence" to operate on Crown Land. Why is it such a big deal to get certain public domain information? Other professionals should be able to access this data through a repository or through agreements.</p> <p>R30: TFL Data – collect and maintain their own data, don't necessarily want to share. FIA Funded data should be public domain.</p> <p>R33: Proprietary aspects (I bought it, it's mine). Competitive advantage. Perceived as a one way street.</p> <p>R34: Concerns about quality of data for Forestry purposes - articulated through the Inventory Challenge Dialogue. There are costs within industry for providing data to government so appropriate standards are important (no extra or complicated standards)</p>	<p>save time checking and updating</p> <p>R29: Have the same level of confidence in the analysis we are doing.</p> <p>R33: Consistency in data (same fields, same QA). Communal approach to cost savings</p>	
Government	<p>R2: Service plans need to be aligned.</p> <p>R5: Remove focus initially from district level to the provincial level</p> <p>R7: Money and budgets. Issue is spread over multiple branches and Ministries.</p> <p>R8: Doesn't usually value time.</p> <p>R9: Standards</p> <p>R11: Does not move quickly to meet business needs</p> <p>R15: The bottom line</p> <p>R18: Standards, funding, capacity</p> <p>R19: Data pricing</p> <p>R21: Budgets / funding over time</p> <p>R33: Moving data into databases (i.e. Fish Inventories)</p> <p>R35: Trust Issues – concern that databases are up to date and contain quality data; Are custodians doing a good job? Is data suited to fit (e.g. what industry wants for FSP's versus what exists; Who has the legal obligation to provide data.</p>	<p>R7: Common base for all data received from Industry. More efficient updating of digital data. Reduced overhead with streamlined agreement.</p> <p>R8: Usually has lots of ideas – and money to pay for them.</p> <p>R9: Cost</p> <p>R11: Build better partnership</p> <p>R15: Working with stakeholders</p> <p>R18: Ground based updates</p> <p>R19: WMS and other means to view such data in place</p> <p>R21: Access to timely information – enhanced decision making abilities</p> <p>R33: Once there is a good place to direct people</p>	<p>R1: See attached late-90's data sharing diagram, developed for and approved by MoFR's Data Custodian Council</p>  <p>F:\!Workgrp\HISDA\PROJECTS\DCC\data</p> <p>R8: Likes to minimize risk – be conservative.</p> <p>R8: Many agency staff used to making decisions without extensive consultation.</p> <p>R24: Need a clear focus on what the standards are. Standards have to be set. Minimize conflicting views. People need to decide and then get on with it.</p> <p>R35: E.g. the Fish Data and Riparian</p>

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
			Management Areas – when using TRIM and Fish Data to develop RMA's why does the Fish Data have caveats? Is the data providing the information the licensees need.
Other Industry	R3: Proprietary info? R3: Understanding their primary motivation (may be different in nature than that of forest industry) R5: Communications required to show benefits R11: Too focus on themselves R15: Bringing them in as a partner R19: Supply of updates back R21: Conflicting motivation	R11: Build better partnership R15: Shared funding R19: ESF and other data submission standard process frameworks R21: Create synergistic partnerships R33: Subsidized data (e.g. if the scope was broadened to non-timber tenures for their management purposes.	R15: Currently working with oil and gas industry R18: the focus here is on the forest industry and the provincial government.
Other (e.g. Other levels of Government, NGO's)	R11: Too focus on themselves R13: Will they share their data? R15: Preventing the establishment of competing warehouses R25: rely on data coming from forestry R27: A big hang-up to openly sharing data with other groups outside the industry. What starts as a narrow focus can start to broaden R33: The accepted standards; higher for researchers, lower for some applications.	R11: Build better partnership R15: Working with stakeholders and benefits of shared funding R25: First Nations' data sharing	R18: the focus here is on the forest industry and the provincial government.
The Risks – general comments for this element			
Consequences of not sharing	R1:- increased costs for all R1:- inevitably people will collect different data from same areas, then compare and argue, or just argue. R5: Moving this out to those that are not direct participants of the FIMW. R7: Decisions made on inaccurate or incomplete data. Working from	R9: Don't have to deal with onerous standards. R14: Common data model for shared information. R18: The opportunities of sharing would be the opposite	R15: Higher overall costs R23: Want to decrease the total cost of ownership. R24: Major benefits to identifying data and what they mean (e.g. Road maintenance – Need data to answer

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	<p>different data from the regulators is always a risk. R8: Might not get data – or have to pay for data. R11: Create differences and costly time and resources R13: Incomplete datasets = no value to anyone. R14: Errors in planning due to not having most current information R18: Increased costs, decreased quality, poorer coordination and collaboration, less data integration R19: Inappropriate data for decisions; increased costs. R20: Working in isolation/divergent models R21: Incorrect or incomplete picture of resource R21: Increased costs for all parties R22: In the FSP world, being “out of date” with data is a big risk. R22: Everyone needs to play ball R23: Replication of effort. Absorbing the costs R24: Costs – we will all be trying to do it on our own and too costly R25: Lack of funding can cause organizations to go away. Needs the political will to sustain R27: If there are multiple licensees in landscape units there will be inaccurate analysis due to not sharing data. Problems with accuracy of boundaries as we move toward Landscape Unit-based planning. R28: Divergent databases. Dysfunctional data sharing. R29 Can’t effectively meet FSP Results and Strategies R30: Everyone is working with own information sources and no complete picture. R33: Wrong decisions are different than sub-optimal decisions Duplication of efforts and expenditures May need to retool to meet QA expectations. R35: The fallacy of data quality. All data looks good until you look at it. It is a vulnerability and a strength to have people look at the data.</p>	<p>R18: The opportunities of not sharing might be a reduction in costs associated with standards compliance and interoperability R19: LRDW and common access methods; lower costs; consistency R21: Holistic picture of industry and resource sector through effective data sharing R24: Remove redundancy in data sets. Apply standards. Simple requirements. Make it simple R25: Recognize data as a “Value” generator. R27: A better picture of what is out there. R35: Data gets better through use.</p>	<p>the question and understand relationships in the data - Reduce costs – reduce risks R28: It’s not about how “right” we are, it’s about how “wrong” we are. R31: What are the risks of sharing? People see and use my data. R34: You can be perceived to be uncooperative if you don’t share data. R35: Be hard on the issues, not the people.</p>
Implications	<p>R1:- incomplete information used to make far-reaching resource decisions. R1:- increased confusion and resultant delayed decision-making. R5: Getting commitment to share all of the identified data for base</p>	<p>R14: Ease of integration of new data into stakeholders’ data models R19: LRDW and common</p>	<p>R18: Not sure the difference between a consequence and an implication</p>

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	maps R9: May not have most current information. R11: No vision of data sharing. R14: Lack of public support for planned activities, questions about land management capabilities. R19: Different outcomes based on source data R20: Quality of submissions R21: Financial and environmental impacts – incorrect decisions based on incomplete data R23: Specific area knowledge that may not get communicated – safety or operational concerns	access methods; lower costs; consistency	
Other factors?	R15: A forest industry facing huge hardship with beetle issues and addressing EBM R15: Huge variability in capability of companies to get involved in data sharing R20: Land management decisions R27: Currentness of data. Results-based planning will be relying on good data to show due diligence: a big risk.		
Roles and Responsibilities – general comments for this element			
Ownership	R11: Culture is at the top R14: Ultimately a government responsibility? R18: Sunk costs, R18: Silo mentality R19: Do not endorse this term unless in business org context R20: Still resides with owner of data R21: 'ownership' not clearly defined R23: Value-added data - How does change get communicated / circulated R25: An ongoing issue (licensees and ENGO's) R27: There may not be a desire to update certain aspects of inventories. Data may not be clean or accurate. Deadline for delivery of updates.	R1: The definition of "ownership" has not been well-defined or publicized across ministries in BC yet. R5: Continue with providing awareness of these roles. R18: Redefine ownership in terms of intellectual property and licensing R21: Provide better definition and communication of roles	R1: In government the definition for "ownership" of information essentially lies at the ministry level, and means the ministry with the legal mandate for that information that falls within its business leadership profile. R15: Need to have Shared ownership of the information resource R22: For people attempting to tie "value" back to their data, this will be a struggle.

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	<p>R28: Appropriate due diligence. "Data Ethic" challenge</p> <p>R30: Generally with "Data Use" agreements, most problems come from District sources and claims that the provincial sources are not up to date.</p> <p>R33: Owners will need to loosen their grip. If you aren't willing to share, it won't work.</p>		<p>R23: A collaborative model has a custodianship challenge currently. If data is being collected to support a "Value Proposition" then it may not be useful to others.</p> <p>R24: Who is going to pay to have it done? The value is to the Province. There needs to be a "body" that takes ownership. Can it be run as a separate business? A major area to address due to costs.</p> <p>R26: Always looking for revenue opportunities (i.e. Creating maps (hunting, fishing). When can and can't we sell slightly modified data?</p> <p>R28: "Data Ethic" is quite poor and not consistent across organizations and people</p>
Custodianship	<p>R1: - Well-defined at MoFR, but not necessarily fully understood at the field level.</p> <p>R1: - good standards defined at ILMB, but years of regionally-defined data and an active cultural bias towards regional data have stalled their implementation.</p> <p>R1: - Need to define/determine the relevance of government's Custodianship role to industry, from a strategic level.</p> <p>R9: This is not communicated very well. Custodians need to understand all the ramifications of their decisions on the clients. Slow in implementing improvements.</p> <p>R11: Need to be aware of responsibilities.</p> <p>R13: Assigning the appropriate custodian can be difficult for some datasets.</p> <p>R29: There needs to be a custodian (What level of involvement? What Oversight role? Needs to crack the whip when necessary.</p>	<p>R11: Business should be the driver on how the data should be managed, accessed and viewed.</p> <p>R13: Can make someone accountable for the quality of the data.</p> <p>R14: We are all custodians when we share data</p> <p>R19: NRSIC materials and work underway to develop Custodianship Guidelines for NR Sector via NRSIWG.</p>	<p>R15: Not well understood, need training.</p> <p>R35: Data will only get fixed if people use it.</p>

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	<p>R33: Who is going to support the custodian aspects over a period of years.</p> <p>R35: Corporate support for data custodianship: filtering down through the organization. Need to push the custodial ethic up through the Organizational Chart. Education of roles and responsibilities of being a custodian. Trying to educate people on being a custodian without the tools. There is a "Custodian" manual but it is big: need an abridged version of the data custodian manual to pass down to line managers.</p>		
Stewardship	<p>R19: Role not formalized enough leading to ambiguity</p> <p>R22: Organizations need a data management maturity to be able to understand data steward responsibilities – need work in this area.</p> <p>R25: Government role</p>	<p>R11: Business should be the driver on how the data should be managed, accessed and viewed.</p> <p>R19: NRSIC materials and work underway to develop Custodianship Guidelines for NR Sector via NRSIWG</p> <p>R23: Centralized repository</p>	<p>R15: A necessary role in a shared environment, Major role for ILMB</p>
Authority	<p>R25: Government role</p>	<p>R19: NRSIC materials and work underway to develop Custodianship Guidelines for NR Sector via NRSIWG</p>	<p>R15: Needs to built through consensus</p>
Operating Policy and Protocols – general comments for this element			
Rules of engagement	<p>R5: Individual policies and mandates within the organizations of the collaborating participants that may affect interpretation or buy in of protocols/policy.</p> <p>R7: Lack of a blanket agreement will lead to significant inefficiencies both in process and procedure</p> <p>R9: What are they?</p> <p>R19: Not consistently defined</p> <p>R21: Should be clearly outlines</p> <p>R23: Communicating the standards - Make sure any changes to standards are communicated in a timely fashion with an opportunity to</p>	<p>R7: The opportunity exists to get a blanket agreement and framework</p> <p>R9: Should understand who we need to go to.</p> <p>R19: Provide level of consistency</p> <p>R21: Provide clear communication of rules</p> <p>R27: Things are getting better.</p>	<p>R15: Need effective legislation, policy and procedures in place.</p> <p>R28: As long as policies continue to meet principles.</p>

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	<p>adopt and adjust (beyond v1 of DEA's). A clearing house or forum for Standards Revisions and a reasonable timeline for adoption.</p> <p>R24: e.g. E-submission with RESULTS: Take common data and try and get people to send it to a central repository. Too many details. The challenge is related to the standards (data integrity / protocols / policy</p> <p>R25: Base mapping is an issue. Have to jump through hoops for the TRIM data. What do you get for it? The more people that use the data, the more feedback.</p> <p>R28: Data Ethic</p> <p>R29: Respect for the current licensee processes within industry. A mechanism in place for a common understanding of where we are going.</p> <p>R33: Access to Private Land and TFL data</p> <p>Agreed upon standards so analysis can be done consistently.</p> <p>R34: If targets are moving all the time it makes it difficult. DEA's are complex and hard to understand. DEA's should be condensed and scaled back to only deal with copyright issues. ESF fills the role for other aspects of DEA's.</p>	<p>Working with other industries to share data quite a bit more in the last few years: a trend that will continue with FSP's.</p> <p>R35: Through FSP information requests one can produce a series of agreements for the same data every year. Put a blanket DEA in place. A "front counter" model to access data. A knowledgeable "single point" of contact.</p>	
Definitions	<p>R7: Common definitions lead to better communication.</p> <p>R19: Not consistently defined</p> <p>R24: E.g. Metadata – different interpretations.</p>	R19: Provide level of consistency	R24: Going to be issues. The simpler we make it, the easier to get there.
Intellectual property	<p>R9: Some datasets are perceived as intellectual but should be confirmed.</p> <p>R21: Must be identified and respected</p> <p>R22: No issues if we are just talking "data".</p> <p>R23: Data Structure and Data Content. Compensation mechanisms around "proprietary" Data Structures</p> <p>R24: Proliferation of "older", public-domain data. Need to get our heads around value added</p> <p>R25: Most Government information and models should be public domain.</p> <p>R28: Shouldn't be any IP issues with straight data on Crown Land</p>	R25: Reduce redundancy should share data and IP processes to save \$	<p>R14: Is this an issue as we are focused on common data that we currently have access to?</p> <p>R15: Can hinder working jointly, need some effective joint intellectual property policies</p> <p>R31: Start off with an IP agreement that is about data sharing "common" data.</p>

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	<p>R30: Depends on how things are interfacing. In general, most of the focus will be on basic data. If a piece of data has been worked on then perhaps it is IP.</p> <p>R33: What is an appropriate citation to get a certain level of credit Let people know that someone may want to use your data and recognize their efforts.</p>		
Other factors?			R15: Need joint policy/procedures around information management that links government and industry process in a Provincial information model
Data to be Shared – general comments for this element			
VRI	<p>R5: Communication of current updates and availability, and determining additional requirements.</p> <p>R7: Need for it to be public, common standards and common quality requirements.</p> <p>R9: Yes</p> <p>R14: Update frequency, access to new data</p> <p>R15: FIA funding</p> <p>R20: Timely updates</p> <p>R22: Update process and much of the provincial landbase needs to be updated</p> <p>R22: An ongoing data model review</p> <p>R23: Adoption and availability of the Standard</p> <p>R24: Lots of legacy data. Trying to upgrade, data integrity, need protocols for data consistency. People don't understand the data.</p> <p>R25: Should be shared</p> <p>R26: Not being able to get what I need. Poor metadata on LRDW</p> <p>R28: Clear understanding of update commitments. Commit to the update schedule</p> <p>R29: Some "schoolyard silliness" around data especially since we are working on Crown Land</p>	<p>R15: FIA funding</p> <p>R19: Now self serve</p> <p>R23: From a software perspective: streamline and update VRI</p> <p>R25: Leverage data as a knowledge base not a data base. E.g. We are good at data collection. Need to leverage into knowledge.</p>	<p>R13: New format looks good and it's free to everyone! Good job.</p> <p>R29: Planning information should be viewed as proprietary until it is "declaired" FIA – funded data should be considered public domain.</p> <p>R30: VRI is the most open.</p> <p>R35: Hard to balance the values between organizations.</p>

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	<p>R30: Don't like the current data model. Rank 1 dataset needs to have other info</p> <p>R34: Industry is not producing VRI, we are receiving it and providing updates. RESULTS submissions should be adequate provided standards are appropriate. Should only need to submit silviculture update once. Need VRI back in a timely manner in a usable, consistent format. VRI isn't the easiest thing to use and it keeps changing.</p>		
TEM / PEM	<p>R5: Completion priority.</p> <p>R9: Yes</p> <p>R14: Common standard for deliverables.</p> <p>R15: Needs common standards</p> <p>R19: Not in LRDW</p> <p>R20: Role this out...what state are we at?</p> <p>R28: PEM is a "development" dataset. Not mature. Needs to evolve. Lacks confidence</p> <p>R30: Hard to get one cohesive database. Needs to be smoothed into a common database.</p>	<p>R19: Make accessible via self serve tools</p> <p>R25: Valuable for Non-timber Forest Products management</p> <p>R35: Building blocks upon which other value-added products are built.</p>	<p>R35: Want to see TEM/PEM become a data requirement for FSP preparation.</p>
Base map	<p>R5: Understanding the specific current needs and downfalls.</p> <p>R7: Common accuracy requirements</p> <p>R9: Yes</p> <p>R13: Standards are too stringent for much of our data to meet (streams collected with handheld GPS)</p> <p>R15: Sustainable funding needed</p> <p>R19: Cost – need for DEA</p> <p>R20: DEA requirements</p> <p>R22: Update process (how does it get updated and how do industry updates get back into the basemap)</p> <p>R22: Cost</p> <p>R25: Perception that this is a public cost</p> <p>R26: Gov web mapping sites – too many. Need a forestry-specific access website.</p> <p>R27: Conflicting data – particularly with different tenures. Spatial Data</p>	<p>R20: Relax update requirements</p> <p>R25: Planimetric should be available to the public. Need to assimilate value-added datasets</p> <p>R28: It would be better if there was a "user fee"</p>	<p>R13: make data operational so we download once, then maintain it.</p> <p>R25: No mechanism (e.g. DEA) to supply harvesting and silviculture information on private land back to Government</p> <p>R26: Quite frustrated with BMGS and existing DEA. Several years back we signed onto a DEA that gave us access to TRIM and FC. FC isn't an issue. TRIM and Orthos are issues and we need to negotiate a new DEA before access to TRIM and Orthos will be granted. We figured that our contribution was</p>

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	<p>consistency R28: You pay for it multiple times. Unsure if the system works for updates R30: Need TRIM2 on the coast. R34: Submitting As-Built roads with standards that are unreasonable</p>		digital updates and that was enough
Registry information	<p>R5: Availability of data. R8: I would rename this cadastre, tenure and administrative boundaries R9: Yes R13: Confidence in it's accuracy is a problem. R14: Access to current information is critical R15: Need a provincial fabric that includes both private and crown as a single seamless database R19: Data Quality issues R22: Big holes in the Cadastral R22: Relationships between organizations regarding Data Sharing R25: Overlaps with so many other datasets. Ned to clean it up. Outdated Ownership coverage is a hindrance to analysis. R28: Can't download cadastral data for broad areas. Cadastral and Administrative data has "vintage" issues Needed to generate reports. Data quality issues need lots of additional work R29: Spend lots of time tracking down information that should be easy to get, therefore the process suffers and results suffer. R30: Need lots of work on the coast. Not in good shape on the coast. Had to "know someone" to get cadastral in the past. R34: Hard to get quality and accurate information on Administration layers and Private Land.</p>	<p>R19: Now self serve R19: Opportunities to put data quality frameworks in place</p>	R5: Additional communications on registry to promote appropriate use with respect to its limitations at this time.
Other (see Assumption 4)?	<p>R9: Contours or DEM R22: Perceived levels of complexity that may not be relevant R22: Cost of data and updates (the Value Proposition) R33: What about other types of data to be shared (e.g. BEC, FC-gets lots of use where VRI doesn't exist? No information on Animals.</p>	R14: Industry specific data such as cut blocks and roads, wildlife reserves.	

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	Scope needs to include Terrestrial Species Inventories and Fish Inventories. R34: Old Tenure boundaries are an issue.		
Change Management and Continuous Improvement – general comments for this element			
Forest Industry	R9: Every time there is a change to a dataset, it takes resources (from clients) to confirm changes and to evaluate the effect. New data is not always better data. R11: Closer partnership at the corporate level R13: As mentioned above. We keep our base data current internally without downloading new tiles. R22: Finding the right person to talk to and knowing what to look for. Lack of Customer service – a service oriented issue. R24: A big contributor to updating and adding value but companies are not in the business of data management. How do you make it simpler for them? Consultants can make it their business R25: Not having a collaborative group. R26: Private land data – do we need to become part of another committee to access this data. R27: Adjusting to new systems and using new systems R28: The more you organize your data, the more things you can do. R29: Why do we make change? What is the rationale for change (to add value or because we are told – is the tail wagging the dog?) Who are we trying to make more effective and what is the cost R33: If it is chronically changing, then it is very frustrating. Need to make sure that FSP's contain up to date information.	R32: Rate of adoption of Standards R25: A continuous leadership group – need a strategy to groom people to take over. Bring in other groups / other people (e.g. Municipal / Energy Sector) – a bigger group of people to pull from. R26: Prefer a “one stop shop” for forestry data. Have data presented in a format I can use directly. If forestry companies had access to data presented for forestry companies. R27: Using LRDW quite a bit. R28: If people truly accounted for the time it took to complete tasks then you could quantify the data management component of the project. R30: Need an organized group meeting 3-4 times a year stewarding the process	R23: Set some objectives for acceptable criteria R31: Early days for data sharing. Not “true” sharing. If you get past the sharing part think “Harmonizing” (1 st order problems, 2 nd order problems). R33: Change management is always good. R35: Datasets get better if people find problems and report back. Government needs to get better at accepting change and implementing change management protocols.
Monitor	R5: Need functioning management process and champion. R15: Need an outcomes based measurement system. R28: We are not there yet Problem trying to win over management support for monitoring R29: Always looking for ways to improve business. The assumption	R23: Level of adoption by organization. How easy is it to adopt? Does it add value or cost you more? R24: A government body that	R24: Continual Improvement. How well defined are the standards and protocols? Who is monitoring that. R29: Someone has to be watching over process flow and quality.

	Issues, Barriers & Challenges	Opportunities	Other Comments
	is that everyone is the same.	ensures standards and protocols are happening. No onerous data collection and data management costs. R27: Feedback from various users. Surveys – assessments R30: Group needs to meet and monitor and make sure things are moving forward and need feedback in that system.	Change will be driven by contributors and government.
Adjust	R24: e.g. RESULTS – Just get it done and hope that the data quality improves annually through a “replace vs update” approach.		
Other factors?	R26: Some data is unattributed. Need standards for posting		

Other general comments about the framework?**Respondent #5:**

234. Would like to see more with respect to a communication strategy.

235. Will this strategy and action plan move outside of the FIMW participants? On page 12, “a data sharing framework that helps organize our collective activities”.... Who are we targeting with respect to our collective activities. I am trying to understand how we will involve others outside of the FIMW participants. Even with industry, divisions have different approaches as well as the variations between district expectations.

Respondent #12

236. Let's be way more tactical and create some achievable targets or you risk failure and irrelevance.

237. Licensees need data and they need it now. Government does not have the same dollar/business pressure and these two premises conflict. Government exists to serve and balance but we are a data sharing backwater and this needs to be radically updated.

Respondent #15

238. Framework should be a solid tool in providing context for capturing issues, discussing options and developing actions.

239. Just as comment – the above matrix as mentioned before does not make a lot of sense to me for capturing input and may have hindered free flow of comment on each item

Respondent #17

240. The above is good, assuming gap analysis will be done to find overlap and holes during the workshop

Respondent #21

241. Has there been consideration given to partnering or interfacing with forest information custodians in other regions (Alberta, Washington, Federal Gov't) to share data across borders?

242. It would help to have a better understanding of the availability of private land information. What is the source of the data and what information would be available

Other general comments about the framework?**Respondent #23**

243. Need momentum moving forward and the ability to produce
244. What is the strategy for following through on the framework

Respondent #24

245. Definitely heading in the right direction
246. A long process to try and move a large group of people toward a common goal.

Respondent #25

247. A really, really good thing.
248. BC has to be part of something new if we evolve from data to knowledge using the tools we currently have.
249. Need money / the will / people to carry this forward.
250. Not just a Forestry information group

Respondent #27

251. A timely and important initiative

Respondent #30

252. A good first attempt. Needs tweaking.
253. What leads on is important.
254. A subcommittee that meets regularly with actions in important

Respondent #33

255. The scope by design is VRI / TEM PEM / TRIM / Registry for industry and government.
256. The scope is limiting.

Respondent #35

257. Smart to pick a couple of datasets to start.

While developing the Framework, the Organizing Team discussed the benefits of undertaking a Business Mapping process. While it was recognized that this could not be accomplished in advance of the workshop the Organizing Team is interested in your perspectives. In an attempt to streamline our business processes through improved alignment with respect to sharing information, would you consider participating in a pilot project with other stakeholders to identify your collective business needs with respect to sharing information, and to map the current business processes you're using and to identify target processes?

Respondent #1

258. No

Respondent #2

259. Yes (this was my question); may be some concerns about the cost of doing this, however.

Respondent #7

260. Again, I don't think the hurdle is the framework or the mechanism. The hurdle is going to be the competing interests and desire to receive more than you are providing. Much of the real value of working from a common base is intangible compared to the cost of getting your own copy that meets your needs. For example, if you do not need the level of accuracy required by the largest common denominator, it is hard to justify paying for it.

Respondent #9

261. Possibly

Respondent #12

262. Getting data from BMGS would be a good exercise with timelines associated.

Respondent #14

263. Perhaps

Respondent #15

264. It might make sense to do this at the sector level. I am sure a number of organizations are already, or have already, done this at the organization level.

Respondent #17

265. Yes

Respondent #18

266. Yes

Respondent #19

267. ILMB CRIM Corporate Data Management and Warehouse Services staff would be interested in participating. We have a body of work being led under the direction of the NRSIWG as well that is directly related.

Respondent #20

268. No

Respondent #21

269. Yes. A pilot project could identify some key barriers and opportunities

Respondent #22

270. Absolutely

Respondent #23

271. Yes

Respondent #27

272. Probably, depending on the commitment

Respondent #28

273. Yes, in principle

274. Pragmatically, what is expected of me within my company. There needs to be a strong Value Proposition in order for me to be given the time to do the work.

275. Need to align business processes for Roads / ESF. There isn't a collective / collaborative Road Management process in BC. No integrated / aggregated Road Database.

Respondent #29

276. Willing to consider

Respondent #30

277. We would like to be there

Respondent #31

278. Sure

Respondent #33

279. There would need to be substantial changes to the scope before I can contribute in a meaningful way.

Respondent #34

280. Tentatively, depends on timing and time commitments.

Input Request #6 — Working Definitions

- **Please review Section 7, the Working Definitions and provide your responses in writing in the accompanying Feedback Form. Please refer to the word or phrase when appropriate.**

Are there definitions that you are not in alignment with? If so, please state the word or phrase and present an alternative definition.

Respondent #1

1. They were good!!

Respondent #2

2. N/A

Respondent #3

3. **Private Lands** - The definitions section of this Challenge Paper defines forest information as including private land parcels (where available). Surely with all the multiple sources of data available to the Provincial Government agencies, they should be able to define the lines between Public Crown Lands and Private Lands.

Respondent #9

4. Forest information needs to include contours or DEM

Respondent #13

5. Just a comment: Data Integrity – Might be my own bias but I never considered “..the assurance that data can only be accessed and altered by those authorized to do so.” To be a data integrity thing. That seems to me to be more of an access/security issue. It works though.

Respondent #13

6. I am comfortable with the definitions, but might suggest this is not the venue to confirm or change a definition that has been articulated by a relevant agency or organization.

Respondent #17

7. Clarification and examples would help

Respondent #18

8. Custodian – I do not see the need for a two level definition
9. Data – need to settle on one definition

Respondent #19

10. Data Sharing / Data Exchange – need more concise definitions

What additional definitions need to be added to this working list in order to add clarity to the Dialogue? Please include a working definition for your additions.

Respondent #1

11. Ownership: Within the Government of British Columbia, information ownership flows from the Crown to government Ministers to Deputy Ministers (or equivalent). [source: GCIO Information Security Policy, Section 2.1.3 b) – see <http://www.cio.gov.bc.ca/prgs/ManualInformationSecurityPolicyV1.pdf>]. Summary: executive ownership lies with the Deputy Minister. Business “ownership” (which we call Custodianship) lies with a Branch Director.

12. The following Corporate Data definitions are from MoFR’s standards; it would be useful to determine industry’s perspective through this process.

Local Corporate Data (see also Full Corporate Data): (source: <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/his/datadmin/corp.htm#Local>)

Local data has meaning in the context of the local program or local area only. Similar information with different definitions or interpretations may exist elsewhere. The data still may be shared among multiple districts. Because of the different definitions or collection standards, when different districts try to share the data there are formatting and translation problems. Trying to share Local data among multiple districts therefore normally requires significant effort before actual sharing can take place. This effort must happen each time sharing is attempted. Local data is normally not defined or measured to a provincial standard. The staff who create Local data may have put some effort into standardization -- the data may be produced by a repeatable but not well-defined process. In other words, the process is repeatable (defined enough for a person to redo the same thing and get the same results), but since it is not fully defined and published, other groups, sections, or district offices will not be able to use it properly without significant effort.

13. Full Corporate Data (see also Local Corporate Data): (source: <http://www.for.gov.bc.ca/his/datadmin/corp.htm#Full>) Full Corporate data is the most mature data, where a Data Custodian has defined ministry standards for its definition, collection, entry, and use. Full Corporate data can be further broken into Shared (used by several business areas -- e.g. Forest Client information) and Program-Specific (all collection and use is within the same line program -- e.g. lightning location data). Most Full Corporate data is Shared -- it is potentially used by many staff or by different programs. The major point that sets Full Corporate data apart from Local Corporate is that it is managed rigorously; it must meet the most stringent ministry-wide standards for accuracy and use, because so many people rely on it to make business decisions.

Respondent #13

14. Perhaps add an access/security definition?

Respondent #14

15. Data Steward - Person responsible for managing the data in a corporation in terms of integrated, consistent definitions, structures, calculations, derivations, and so on. <http://www.tdan.com/i002fe03.htm>

Respondent #17

16. Good enough for initial starting place.

Input Request #7 — Next Steps and Other Comments**Do you have any questions or comments regarding the next steps?****Respondent #8**

1. I would agree understanding what motivates groups (values) is critical to making something work.

Respondent #13

2. Looks good. If possible having the “Workshop Workbook” available May 3rd or earlier would allow participants at least one full working day to prepare for the workshop on the 7th.

Respondent #20

3. What expectations do we have for the face to face meeting?
4. What do we wish to take forward to FIM

Are there any other comments you would like to add regarding this Dialogue overall?**Respondent #1**

5. The team has done a very good job putting this together. Well done!!

Respondent #2

6. Why is the opportunity for feedback happening so late (given the upcoming workshop on May 7)? Participants from the 2006 FIMW will likely need some explanation...

Respondent #3

7. The cover of the Challenge Paper states it is: Sponsored by two Ministries and one Bureau; Co-Championed by two Bureau representatives, and a Licensee representative, and supported by three consulting firms. There is a clear need to identify one person who is accountable for the overall success of this initiative.

Respondent #5

8. Good attempt to reach a baseline level of understanding and seek input so that a more focused discussion may occur with respect to reaching common understandings and commitments, and where more explanation may be required on specific aspects of the framework.

Respondent #8

9. I think this questionnaire is too large and wordy – which may dissuade some from getting involved. I would consider doing something briefer.

Respondent #9

10. I appreciate the complexity of this topic. We must strive for streamlined approaches in dealing with this.

Respondent #11

11. The business need to drive the data priorities, data storage, access and management, and supporting tools. Business people should be managing the warehouse/s, and IM/IT support it.

Respondent #13

12. Thoughts for the next one: This process is a good one but there would probably be more response from a more to the point questionnaire. Perhaps a few folks are targeted with the full process and most others get the abbreviated version?

Respondent #15

13. Looking forward to the face to face.

Respondent #19

14. Difficult template/process to follow

Respondent #20

15. Somewhat confusing section 5 question 9 to answer.

Respondent #21

16. This is a good start and should provoke a worthwhile discussion

Respondent #24

17. Make it simple and cost effective
18. How many people actually understand the business on data sharing?

Respondent #24

19. Feels like the document is written for a wide range of audience. Wanted it to be more Forest Industry data specific in nature.
20. If you are trying to get buy-in and agreement, the language needs to be simplified.

**Thanks again for your
contributions!**