Concerns / Issues:

- The 5/13/11 draft appears to been developed without consultation and presented – What was the process used to derive this model?

- The model does not address the key issues brought out by the NCHEMS and SHEEO reports – eg. In the NCHEM report – “The most serious issues that surfaced concerned: insufficiently focused high-level attention to and inconsistent communication about data governance”. The proposed model seems to increase the separation between high-level administration and data use and users.

- Layer 3 (Legislative Branch) needs to be defined more clearly – members and responsibilities.

- How does the structure promote communication across the layers?

- How does this data structure empower IRAO?
  - IRAO position in the structure is too low – does not empower per SHEEO report.

- One member raised the Assessment and governance issue

- The model does not follow the recommendation in the Hans L'Orange report. It appears to build a structure without knowing what the system has in place (see page 10 of report, Catalog all Existing Data-related Activity and Needs.)

- Complicated and a lot of layers.

- Data structure may not be compatible with UH Data Governance.

- How does the structure evaluate the performance adequacy?