

## Policy Committee Subgroup

October 13, 2008

### Discussion Items

The sole discussion item today is the Policy Document distributed by Merri Beth last week; now re-numbered IP-05. The goal today is to discuss and approve the policy, which is accompanied by supporting documents which are standards or procedures.

Merri Beth noted that there is an extensive vetting process for the Policies; the standards or supporting documents can be changed by the Policy Committee as they see fit without outside vetting.

- 1) Vic would like to see the first part of the policy clearly state what the document is about. The group suggested that we move first paragraph of the Policy statement to the Rationale. A new title for the Policy. New second paragraph under Policy will be slightly reworded. Change the title to simply "Institutional Data".
- 2) The two bullet points and Ip-05.3 is mixing appropriate use together. The bullet point 3 alludes to the management of data with appropriate data dictionary tools, etc. IP-05.3 is about use, not management. May need to parse out a standard to relate to the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet from IP-05.3 (specifically 3, part of 4 and part of 6). These relate directly to the responsibility of the users and their understanding of the Policy. It's a shared responsibility between the CDS and management such as central offices and unit management. This leads to a new standard IP-05.4. How does this relate to IP-05.1 then? This covers all levels of managers and users. Therefore, it doesn't sound like we need IP-05.4. The groups stated that maybe we are going into too much detail in IP-05.3. However, this is a standard, not a policy.
- 3) What is required from an auditing or legal perspective? Usually just procedures which educate users as long as you do not put "require" in the Policy.
- 4) Reviewing bullet number one, the change to "individuals".
- 5) Merri Beth and Eric will make the changes noted and the group approves of the Policy.

### Standards IP-05.1 Discussion

- 1) Move Committee of Data Stewards until after you define what a Data Steward is according to Vic. Merri Beth noted it is not a definition but the responsibility of the CDS. This is fine, but there is no law noted in IP-05.2. Paul noted the requirement in IP-05.1 for Data Managers may be too stringent relating to training and even documentation of who has access. Should this only apply to Level 2 and Level 1 access? Yes.

### Standards IP-05.2

- 1) Steve asked if we are absolutely sure we need to create a 4<sup>th</sup> level (new)? The only real difference is encryption required for Level 1 and the requirement for explanation of why this data is needed. Could we just have two different levels within Level 2, or what would really be Level 1? Vic pointed out that it isn't the data by itself, but within a certain context, e.g. SSN and

someone's name together. Paul pointed out that if we do keep a separate level, it would make it easier to add to this level. We still want 4 levels with 1 being the strictest.

Steve noted that this will probably be the last subgroup meeting for this semester.

**Action Items**

A1) Merri Beth and Eric will make changes to the Policy as noted, and it will then be sent through the vetting process.