

Data Services Prioritization Process

Alaska Regional Office

Quality Management Efforts in AKRO

- AKRO reorganization – centralized Application Development team
 - How do we not break what worked in decentralized model?
- Software application development process improvement
- QM Training with FIS QM Professional Specialty Group
 - Value Stream Mapping
 - Regulation development process tracking
 - QM process improvement Council staff, GC, SF

Data Services Steering Committee Purpose

- prioritize application development work & associated infrastructure needs of the Alaska Regional Office.
- ensure understanding ISD customer requirements and needs.

Members

- The DSSC is be made up of the AKRO **data stewards** and data support staff from ISD.
- Data documentation plan:
 - Developed inventory of data assets & data stewards
 - Defined data roles and responsibilities

Data Stewards/Owners

- The people who make operational decisions with respect to data handling procedures, access control, data quality requirements, and data documentation. Individuals with the most in-depth understanding of the data, its context, quality, integrity, and appropriate use.
 - Provide a link between the data users and the Information System Manager (bridge between technology and the business). Assists with IT program design and translates Council and regulatory requirements into IT requirements.
 - Act as "subject matter expert" for data and the collection of those data.
 - Sets specific and measurable goals for data quality.
 - Assures adequate and appropriate access to data (review and maintain list of users with access to confidential data)

Inventory of Assets & Data Stewards

Data Set	Description	Data Steward(s)
Core Data System	The Alaska Core data system consists of application-independent entities and a set of consistent mechanisms for representing the following common concepts among divisions and between agencies conducting fisheries management in Alaska: Species; Products; Gear; Management Areas; Person demographics; Vessels; and Processing facilities.	Jennifer Mondragon & Tracy Buck
Blend System	The Blend was the system which was used by the NMFS Alaska Regional Office to monitor groundfish catch from 1991 until 2002. The Blend system combined data from industry production reports and observer reports to make the best, comprehensive accounting of groundfish catch. These data are used to manage quotas for groundfish in the Gulf of Alaska, Bering Sea, and Aleutian Islands. The blend catch data were also used as the basis for computing estimates of prohibited species bycatch. Prohibited species include Pacific halibut, salmon, herring, and crabs. Blend data were used for numerous regional and national reports, fishery stock assessments, and analysis of fishery management plans.	Jennifer Mondragon & Mary Furuness
Catch Accounting System	The Catch Accounting System is used by the Alaska Region of National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to estimate total catch in the Federal groundfish fisheries in waters off Alaska. The estimates for total catch are specific to species and fisheries and are used to manage about 600 separate groundfish quotas and prohibited species catch limits in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands and Gulf of Alaska.	Jennifer Mondragon & Mary Furuness
Community Development Quota Groundfish System	The Western Alaska Community Development Quota (CDQ) Program allocates a percentage of all Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands quotas for groundfish, prohibited species. The purpose of the CDQ Program is to provide the means for starting or supporting commercial fisheries business activities that will result in an ongoing, regionally based, fisheries-related economy in Western Alaska . This was the legacy system for managing CDQ Groundfish from 1991-2007. After 2008, CDQ groundfish was incorporated into the Catch Accounting System.	Jennifer Mondragon & Mary Furuness
Charter Halibut Limited Access Program	This limited access system limits the number of charter vessels that may participate in the guided sport fishery for halibut in IPHC areas 2C and 3A. NMFS issued a charter halibut permit to a licensed charter fishing business owner based on his or her past participation in the charter halibut fishery, to non-profit Community Quota Entities representing specific rural communities, and to military morale, recreational and welfare programs. All charter halibut permit holders are subject to limits on the number of permits they may hold and except for military CHPs, on the number of charter vessel anglers who may catch and retain halibut on permitted charter vessels. Permits are transferable or non-transferable and have a single area endorsement Charter harvest reporting occurs via State of Alaska Saltwater logbooks and surveys. This program would be modified by provisions of the Pacific Halibut Catch Sharing Program, if that action is approved.	Tracy Buck

DSSC Members

- SF (catch statistics, landings, quota monitoring)
- RAM (permits)
- Protected Resources (marine mammal observer program, stranding database)
- Analysis Team (spatial data tools)
- ISD (application developers, IT infrastructure)

Project evaluation

- **Step 1: A Project Nomination form**
- **Step 2: High level go/no-go decision (done by DSSC)**
 - Is this project with the scope of the Alaska Regional Office's responsibilities?
 - Is this project within the scope of responsibility of ISD?
 - Can this project meet regional security requirements?
- **Step 3: Projects are prioritized by the DSSC data stewards:**
 - Beneficiaries
 - Impacts
 - Risk

Resource Assessment

For high priority projects, a resources assessment is completed by DSSC Technology support staff, based on input from from data stewards:

- Money
- Personnel
- Infrastructure
- Support

Project Evaluation Factors

Beneficiaries	10%		
		Who will benefit from the project?	50%
		Who asked for the project?	50%
Risk	35%		
		Are prospective participants on-board?	34%
		How certain is the scope for this project?	33%
		Are all prerequisite technologies and projects ready?	33%

Project Evaluation Factors

Impacts	55%		
		How will failure to pursue the project adversely affect AKR?	12%
		Will failure to pursue the project lead to adverse public relations?	3%
		Is this a mandated project (by regulation or HQ)?	21%
		Is this an existing AKR function?	6%
		Does this project enhance the capability of AKR?	6%
		Does this project increase the quality of AKR efforts?	10%
		Is there a mandated timeline? (Yes/No)	13%
		Could this project reduce future costs for AKR?	6%
		Do other high priority projects depend on this project?	10%
		Is there no alternative or work-around for this project?	13%

Prioritization Matrix

(Access the DSSC menu on the menu bar above to add and remove projects and reviewers.)

		IFQ Hired Master Control date	GAF	CDQ Halibut online Transfers	Amendment 80 Online Transfers	FPP Online Renewals	CAS Redesign	Web Apps Redesign	eLandings enhancement (including elog)	Permit System Upgrades	Observer Fees	CAS Enhancemer	SF JIRA Support	
Score		76.26	76.20	47.78	51.52	50.17	65.68	61.44	69.11	65.24	89.34	67.95	43.56	
Rank		2	3	12	10	11	7	9	5	8	1	6	14	
DSS		3	2											
Is this a viable project (Yes/No)?		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	\$1.00	80	90	50	50	50	60	70	80	70	100	90	60	
Who will benefit from the project? (Enter all that apply, separated by commas.)	\$0.50	AKR AGENCY PARTICIPANT COUNCIL PUBLIC	AKR COUNCIL PUBLIC AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR COUNCIL PUBLIC AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR PUBLIC AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR PUBLIC AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR COUNCIL PUBLIC PARTICIPANT AGENCY	AKR COUNCIL PUBLIC PARTICIPANT AGENCY	AKR COUNCIL PUBLIC AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR COUNCIL AGENCY	A P C
Who asked for the project? (Enter all that apply, separated by commas.)	\$0.50	AKR COUNCIL PARTICIPANT	AKR COUNCIL AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR PARTICIPANT	AKR PARTICIPANT	AKR PARTICIPANT	AKR	AKR AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR PUBLIC AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR PUBLIC	AKR COUNCIL PUBLIC AGENCY PARTICIPANT	AKR PUBLIC COUNCIL PARTICIPANT	AKR COUNCIL AGENCY	A P C
	\$1.00	66.36	68.31	26.93	32.84	31.89	50.12	43.48	63.22	61.15	83.99	55.74	27.94	
How will failure to pursue the project adversely affect AKR?	\$0.12	79.00	95.00	29.17	35.83	32.00	80.00	41.25	79.00	73.75	100.00	63.00	13.00	
Will failure to pursue the project lead to adverse public relations?	\$0.03	54.00	95.00	37.50	35.00	39.00	49.00	42.50	77.00	73.75	99.00	43.00	4.00	
Is this a mandated project (by regulation or HQ)?	\$0.21	100.00	100.00	0.00	8.33	4.00	14.00	12.50	62.00	43.75	100.00	40.00	2.00	
Is this an existing AKR function?	\$0.06	100.00	30.00	83.33	83.33	80.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	60.00	100.00	100.00	
Does this project enhance the capability of AKR?	\$0.06	17.00	75.00	71.67	74.17	74.00	78.00	93.75	95.00	98.75	99.00	97.00	76.00	
Does this project increase the quality of AKR efforts?	\$0.10	0.00	10.00	75.00	77.50	78.00	99.00	98.75	89.00	100.00	63.00	68.00	93.00	
Is there a mandated timeline? (Yes/No)	\$0.13	88.00	80.00	0.00	8.33	0.00	3.00	0.00	20.00	20.00	100.00	41.00	0.00	
Could this project reduce future costs for AKR?	\$0.06	30.00	6.00	75.00	87.50	90.00	99.00	93.75	32.00	100.00	30.00	49.00	23.00	
Do other high priority projects depend on this project?	\$0.10	10.00	20.00	10.00	16.67	10.00	79.00	75.00	12.00	6.25	43.75	25.00	20.00	
Is there no alternative or work-around for this project?	\$0.13	100.00	100.00	0.00	4.17	20.00	10.00	0.00	93.00	75.00	100.00	70.00	20.00	
	\$1.00	90.76	84.66	79.92	81.30	78.93	91.75	87.21	75.25	70.30	94.72	80.85	63.40	
Are prospective participants on-board?	\$0.34	100.00	100.00	99.17	100.00	97.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.00	70.00	
How certain is the scope for this project?	\$0.33	72.00	76.00	85.00	88.33	83.00	82.00	85.00	32.00	35.00	89.00	64.00	45.00	
Are all prerequisite technologies and projects ready?	\$0.33	100.00	77.50	55.00	55.00	56.25	93.00	76.25	93.00	75.00	95.00	79.00	75.00	

Selection ▾ Mondragon ▾ Gharrett ▾ Buck ▾ Furuness ▾ Zuniga ▾ Lewis ▾ Bibb ▾

Report for leadership

AKR DSSC Prioritization Results

This summary report describes the AKR DSSC project prioritization results as of 8/13/2013

Rank	Project Name	Description	Viability	Notes	Parties Involved	Score
1	Observer Fees		Yes		SF RAM OMD ISD CONTRACTORS	89.34
2	GAF		Yes	This is a sample note about the viability of the GAF project.	SF RAM ISD CONTRACTORS	76.20
3	IFQ Hired Master Control date		Yes	This is a sample note about DSSC Rank for the IFQ Hired Master Control Date project.	SF RAM ISD CONTRACTORS	76.26
4	Flatfish Flexibility		Yes		SF RAM ISD CONTRACTORS	69.19
5	eLandings enhancements (including elog)		Yes		SF ISD CONTRACTORS	69.11
6	CAS Enhancements		Yes		SF ISD CONTRACTORS	67.95

Lessons Learned

- Working Well
 - Application Developed aligned with regional priorities set by data stewards
 - Improved understanding & communication with leadership
 - Growing awareness of data stewardship roles (it isn't just an "IT thing")
- Challenges
 - Not all data stewards participating all the time
- Next Steps
 - Still need to engage data stewards in completing data documentation & in data management plan development