



## Appendix D: Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

**Meeting:** Data Quality Steering Committee Meeting - #1

**Date:** February 27, 2004

### Objective

To provide the Steering Committee with an overview of Data Strategy, the Data Quality Implementation Methodology, and review proposed meeting agenda.

### Agenda/ Attendees

The agenda items for this meeting were:

- Data Strategy Overview
- Data Quality Implementation Methodology
- Participants, Schedule, and Next Steps

Invitees were as follows. Attendees marked with an X.

Name	Attendance	Business/System Area	E-Mail	Phone (Work)
Beavers, Rosemary		FSA	Rosemary.Beavers@ed.gov	202.377.3126
Brown, Nate	X	Accenture	nathan.r.brown@accenture.com	202.962.0868
Fontana, Matt		FSA	Matteo.Fontana@ed.gov	202.377.3005
Hill, Paul	X	FSA	Paul.Hill.JR@ed.gov	202.377.4323
Holman, Jane	X	FSA	Jane.Holman@ed.gov	202.377.4322
Meyers, Julie	X	Accenture	julie.m.meyers@accenture.com	202.962.0782
Patton, Jason	X	Accenture	jason.m.patton@accenture.com	202.962.0712
Ragan, Dan	X	Accenture	daniel.p.ragan@accenture.com	703.947.4327
Saunders, Jeanne	X	FSA	Jeanne.Saunders@ed.gov	202.377.3246
Vigna, Dwight	X	FSA	Dwight.Vigna@ed.gov	202.377.3436
Wilson, Keith	X	FSA	Keith.Wilson@ed.gov	202.377.3591

### Topic 1: Data Quality Steering Committee Kickoff

**Presenter:** Nate Brown, Jason Patton, Dan Ragan

**Handouts:** Data Quality Steering Committee Kickoff Presentation (Reference 152.1.10a)  
Appendix E Presentation Materials #1 Kickoff.ppt)

**Key points/Decisions Made:**

- A key focus of the Data Quality effort is to reflect data issues within the FSA program that require evaluation.



- The Data Quality Assurance Methodology was reviewed. There are four phases of the methodology:
  - Data Quality Prioritization: Phase in which the Steering Committee will identify and rank data quality issues.
  - Data Quality Assessment: Phase in which cross system business and technical representatives are enlisted into a working group to analyze data quality issues. Data will be inspected, defects measured, and sample data determined for testing.
  - Data Quality Improvement: Phase in which solutions are developed and implemented for the data quality issues.
  - Data Quality Oversight: Phase in which the quality of the enterprise's data continues to be measured and agreed upon quality standards are met.

Comments from the group:

- An additional level of Data Strategy Objectives should be identified. The material covers strategic and tactical objectives, but would like to have a set of objectives that cover for example, reducing the cost of operating systems, improving program integrity, and misaligned program dollars.
- Open Data Quality questions should be integrated with IPMS.
- Every issue does not have to go through entire methodology. Developing feasibility checkpoints and determining when/where each issue should go through process is recommended. In addition, creation of different focus groups to identify and assess issues with phases is also recommended.
- The Data Strategy Methodology should be tied to the budget cycles.
- Data Quality Prioritization Phase: Incorporate vulnerability assessment in this phase. In addition, documentation should include Enterprise Change Management.
- Data Quality Assessment Phase: Also incorporate vulnerability assessment in this phase. Key point for this phase is figuring out the scope to fix each issue.
- Data Quality Improvement Phase: This phase should include Enterprise Change Management tracking. This is the most efficient way to track issues. In addition, the solution does not always have to be implemented into production. An issue can have multiple solutions/recommendations including process improvements, code fixes, or policy/legislation changes.
- Data Quality Oversight Phase: Proper Analysis also maps to performance measures and includes user acceptance. This process needs to include an additional step for reevaluating the methodology.
- Integration Partner will work with Jane Holman to determine future Steering Committee make-up.



Issues:

N/A

## Action Items

Number	Action	Responsible	Date Assigned	Date Due	Status
DQ1	Identification of additional level of Data Strategy Objectives	Jane Holman , Jason Patton, Dan Ragan	2/27/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ2	Define and identify difference between IQCU and IV&V	Jeanne Saunders, Dwight Vigna	2/27/04	TBD	In Progress

## Next Meeting

- Date/Time: Tuesday, March 9, 2004, 3:30PM - 4:30PM Room 64D1-2
- Topic: Steering Committee Roles and Responsibilities/ Review of Issue Management Report Template
- Presenter(s): Dan Ragan



**Meeting:** Data Quality Steering Committee Meeting - #2  
**Date:** March 9, 2004

## Objective

To review the Steering Committee and Working Groups roles and responsibilities during the Data Quality initiative.

## Agenda/ Attendees

The agenda items for this meeting were:

- Data Quality Steering Committee Roles and Responsibilities
- Data Quality Working Group Roles and Responsibilities
- Questions

Invitees were as follows. Attendees marked with an X.

Name	Attendance	Business/System Area	E-Mail	Phone (Work)
Beavers, Rosemary	X	FSA	Rosemary.Beavers@ed.gov	202.377.3126
Eliadis, Pam	X	FSA	Pam.Eliadis@ed.gov	202.377.3554
Hill, Paul	X	FSA	Paul.Hill.JR@ed.gov	202.377.4323
Holman, Jane	X	FSA	Jane.Holman@ed.gov	202.377.4322
Hurt, Jay		FSA	John.Hurt@ed.gov	202.377.3453
Leith, Bill		FSA	William.Leith@ed.gov	202.377.3676
Meyers, Julie	X	Accenture	julie.m.meyers@accenture.com	202.962.0782
Patton, Jason	X	Accenture	jason.m.patton@accenture.com	202.962.0712
Ragan, Dan	X	Accenture	daniel.p.ragan@accenture.com	703.947.4327
Rockis, Mike	X	FSA	Mike.Rockis@ed.gov	202.377.3540
Saunders, Jeanne	X	FSA	Jeanne.Saunders@ed.gov	202.377.3246
Vigna, Dwight	X	FSA	Dwight.Vigna@ed.gov	202.377.3436
White, Marge	X	FSA	Marge.White@ed.gov	202.377.3022
Wilson, Keith	X	FSA	Keith.Wilson@ed.gov	202.377.3591

## Topic 1: Data Quality Roles and Responsibilities

**Presenter:** Dan Ragan

**Handouts:** Data Quality Roles and Responsibilities Presentation (Reference 152.1.10a Appendix E Presentation Materials #2 Roles.ppt)

**Key points/Decisions Made:**

- The Data Quality Roles and Responsibilities were reviewed. Reference meeting presentation for specifics.



Comments from the group:

- Quality is a system function. The Steering Committee will raise awareness of enterprise data quality issues and facilitate the issue resolution with assistance from business owners.
- Issue prioritization by the Steering Committee and the establishment of internal quality units within each system will assist with resource availability issues.
- The Steering Committee role, Financial Aid Life Cycle Subject Matter Expert, will have an additional responsibility which includes knowledge of enterprise initiatives and integration.
- Denise Hill and Terry Woods were recommended to be members of the Steering Committee and be responsible for the FSA Tech Architecture Specialist role.
- The Steering Committee role, FSA Enterprise Initiative Liaison, has been renamed to FSA IT Management Liaison.
- The Working Group role, FSA System Database Administrator/Technical Architect, has been renamed to Contractor Application Architect.
- Steering Committee mentioned having an additional role which would monitor the necessary skill sets required to address data quality issues. Additional responsibilities would include ensuring all data quality components are met and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) are in place going forward.

## **Topic 2: Data Quality Issue Management Detailed Report Format**

Presenter: Julie Meyers

Handouts: Data Quality Issue Management Detailed Report (Reference 152.1.10a Appendix G Data Quality Detailed Issue Report.rtf); Data Quality Issue Management Summary Report (Reference 152.1.10a Appendix F Data Quality Summary Issue Report.rtf); Data Quality Detailed Issue Report Table Description (Reference 152.1.10a Appendix I Data Quality Issue Mgmt Tool Data Dictionary.doc);

Key points/Decisions Made:

- Reference meeting materials for specifics.

Comments from the group:

- Data Quality Issue Management Detailed Issue Report:
  - Once an issue has been through the Steering Committee process, the issue will be placed into the Change Management Process if new development is required.
  - Ensure consistency throughout report fields, e.g. systems impacted are captured accurately throughout the report.



- The report field, Business Channels impacted, does not need to be captured going forward. The Business Capability Area report field is suffice and more pertinent to capture.
  - For each issue, there can be multiple Assignees and Resolvers. This functionality will be added to the Data Quality Issue Management Tool.
- Data Quality Issue Management Summary Report:
- Generic values for the resolution description field need to be identified.
- Data Quality Detailed Issue Report Table Description:
- Add “Third Party Developers” as an option for Trading Partners Impacted.
  - Delete Pending as one of the options for Status. If an issue is scheduled for a future release it will be placed in the resolved status and upon review by the Steering Committee, they may decide if the issues should be closed. In addition, issues that fall under this category will be tracked on the systems list of Deferred Issues for Future Releases and not by the Steering Committee.

Issues:

N/A

## Action Items

Number	Action	Responsible	Date Assigned	Date Due	Status
DQ1	Identification of additional level of Data Strategy Objectives	Jane Holman , Jason Patton, Dan Ragan	2/27/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ2	Define and identify difference between IQCU and IV&V	Jeanne Saunders, Dwight Vigna	2/27/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ3	Review Data Quality Issues for accuracy	Dan Ragan, Julie Meyers	3/09/04	TBD	In Progress

## Next Meeting

- Date/Time: TBD
- Topic: Review Data Quality Issues
- Presenter(s): Julie Meyers



**Meeting:** Data Quality Steering Committee Meeting - #3  
**Date:** April 13, 2004

## Objective

To provide the Steering Committee with an overview and description of the Prioritization Phase in the Data Quality Implementation Methodology and its associated business templates.

## Agenda/ Attendees

The agenda items for this meeting were:

- Data Quality Implementation Methodology: Prioritization Phase Overview
- Data Quality Implementation Methodology: Associated Prioritization Business Templates
- Questions

Invitees were as follows. Attendees marked with an X.

Name	Attendance	Business/System Area	E-Mail	Phone (Work)
Beavers, Rosemary		FSA	Rosemary.Beavers@ed.gov	202.377.3126
Chauvin, Karen	X	FSA	Karen.C Chauvin@ed.gov	202.377.4274
Eliadis, Pam	X	FSA	Pam.Eliadis@ed.gov	202.377.3554
Hill, Paul	X	FSA	Paul.Hill.JR@ed.gov	202.377.4323
Holman, Jane	X	FSA	Jane.Holman@ed.gov	202.377.4322
Hurt, Jay		FSA	John.Hurt@ed.gov	202.377.3453
Leith, Bill		FSA	William.Leith@ed.gov	202.377.3676
Meyers, Julie	X	Accenture	julie.m.meyers@accenture.com	202.962.0782
Patton, Jason	X	Accenture	jason.m.patton@accenture.com	202.962.0712
Ragan, Dan	X	Accenture	daniel.p.ragan@accenture.com	703.947.4327
Rockis, Mike	X	FSA	Mike.Rockis@ed.gov	202.377.3540
Saunders, Jeanne		FSA	Jeanne.Saunders@ed.gov	202.377.3246
Vigna, Dwight		FSA	Dwight.Vigna@ed.gov	202.377.3436
White, Marge	X	FSA	Marge.White@ed.gov	202.377.3022
Wilson, Keith	X	FSA	Keith.Wilson@ed.gov	202.377.3591

## Topic 1: Data Quality Implementation Methodology: Prioritization Phase Business Templates

**Presenter:** Dan Ragan

**Handouts:** Data Quality Implementation Methodology: Prioritization Phase Business Templates Presentation (Reference 152.1.10a Appendix E Presentation Materials #3 Prioritization.ppt); Data Quality Business Objectives Handout;



Key points/Decisions Made:

- The Data Quality Prioritization Phase and Business Templates were reviewed. Reference meeting presentation for specifics.

Comments from the group:

- The identification of more specific business objectives is necessary in order to align and prioritize the data quality issues.
- Need to identify if there are existing tools being used for data quality tracking and maintenance.
- Diane O'Hara was recommended to be a member of the Steering Committee and be included in the next Steering Committee meeting.
- The following criteria was identified by the Steering Committee has potential prioritization business objectives:
  - Erroneous payments to recipients
  - Erroneous payments to Trading Partners
  - Ability to do budget
  - Program Integrity/Program Oversight
  - Systems Integration
  - Human Capital Management
  - Student/Borrower's Eligibility
  - Financial Statements/Annual Audit
  - Data Interfaces – System to System
  - Customer Service
  - School/Partner Eligibility
  - Default Prevention
  - Accurate Billing
  - Privacy Act Data

Issues:

N/A



## Action Items

Number	Action	Responsible	Date Assigned	Date Due	Status
DQ1	Identification of additional level of Data Strategy Objectives	Jane Holman , Jason Patton, Dan Ragan	2/27/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ2	Define and identify difference between IQCU and IV&V	Jeanne Saunders, Dwight Vigna	2/27/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ3	Review Data Quality Issues for accuracy	Dan Ragan, Julie Meyers	3/09/04	3/12/04	Closed
DQ4	Identify prioritization criteria	Dan Ragan, Julie Meyers	04/13/04	04/20/04	In Progress
DQ5	Research to identify existing Data Quality Tracking tools	Jane Holman, Jason Patton, Dan Ragan	04/13/04	TBD	In Progress

## Next Meeting

- Date/Time: Tuesday, April 20, 2004 3:00 PM - 4:30 PM
- Topic: Prioritization of Data Quality Issues
- Presenter(s): Dan Ragan



**Meeting:** Data Quality Steering Committee Meeting - #4  
**Date:** April 20, 2004

## Objective

To review and rank data quality issue prioritization criteria along with discussing data quality issue categorizations.

## Agenda/ Attendees

The agenda items for this meeting were:

- Review data quality issue prioritization criteria
- Rank data quality issue prioritization criteria
- Review data quality issue categorizations
- Questions

Invitees were as follows. Attendees marked with an X.

Name	Attendance	Business/System Area	E-Mail	Phone (Work)
Beavers, Rosemary		FSA	Rosemary.Beavers@ed.gov	202.377.3126
Chauvin, Karen	X	FSA	Karen.Chauvin@ed.gov	202.377.4274
Eliadis, Pam		FSA	Pam.Eliadis@ed.gov	202.377.3554
Hill, Paul		FSA	<a href="mailto:Paul.Hill.JR@ed.gov">Paul.Hill.JR@ed.gov</a>	202.377.4323
Holman, Jane	X	FSA	<a href="mailto:Jane.Holman@ed.gov">Jane.Holman@ed.gov</a>	202.377.4322
Hurt, Jay	X	FSA	John.Hurt@ed.gov	202.377.3453
Leith, Bill		FSA	William.Leith@ed.gov	202.377.3676
Meyers, Julie	X	Accenture	julie.m.meyers@accenture.com	202.962.0782
O'Hara, Diana	X	FSA	Diana.OHara@ed.gov	202.377.3466
Patton, Jason	X	Accenture	jason.m.patton@accenture.com	202.962.0712
Ragan, Dan	X	Accenture	daniel.p.ragan@accenture.com	703.947.4327
Rockis, Mike		FSA	Mike.Rockis@ed.gov	202.377.3540
Saunders, Jeanne		FSA	Jeanne.Saunders@ed.gov	202.377.3246
Vigna, Dwight	X	FSA	Dwight.Vigna@ed.gov	202.377.3436
White, Marge	X	FSA	Marge.White@ed.gov	202.377.3022
Wilson, Keith		FSA	Keith.Wilson@ed.gov	202.377.3591

## Topic 1: Data Quality Prioritization

Presenter: Dan Ragan

Handouts: Data Quality Issue Types Document; Prioritization Ranking Tool Diagram;



Key points/Decisions Made:

- The Data Quality issue prioritization criteria was reviewed and ranked according to the AHP method using the objectives identified in the 4/13 meeting. The Prioritization method using weight from criteria was explained. In addition, the data quality issue categories were discussed. Reference meeting documentation for specifics.

Comments from the group:

- Use visibility as a weighting factor instead of a criterion.
- Combined other related criteria (oversight/integrity; spans multiple systems/system integration).
- Added cycle time criterion.
- Within the Data Access category of issues, include increasing program integrity and oversight in definition.
- Data Standards is an additional task that needs to be defined and implemented throughout the enterprise. FSA needs to research this topic and possibly add as a task in the future involving the Data Quality Steering Committee.
- Detailed explanation of ranking process to be included in Deliverable 152.1.10a.

Issues:

- Order of prioritization did not come out as expected, required further review.

## Action Items

Number	Action	Responsible	Date Assigned	Date Due	Status
DQ1	Identification of additional level of Data Strategy Objectives	Jane Holman , Jason Patton, Dan Ragan	2/27/04	4/20/04	Closed
DQ2	Define and identify difference between IQCU and IV&V	Jeanne Saunders, Dwight Vigna	2/27/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ4	Identify prioritization criteria	Dan Ragan, Julie Meyers	04/13/04	04/20/04	Closed
DQ5	Research to identify existing Data Quality Tracking tools	Jane Holman, Jason Patton, Dan Ragan	04/13/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ6	Review and update criteria ratings	Steering Committee	04/20/04	TBD	In Progress



## Next Meeting

- Date/Time: TBD
- Topic: TBD
- Presenter(s): TBD



**Meeting:** Data Quality Steering Committee Meeting - #5  
**Date:** April 27, 2004

## Objective

To finalize prioritization rankings and begin prioritizing the Top Ten issues and Quick Hits.

## Agenda/ Attendees

The agenda items for this meeting were:

- Review and finalize criteria rankings for prioritization
- Review and finalize question and answer types for criteria for prioritization
- Prioritize Top Ten and Quick Hits
- Questions

Invitees were as follows. Attendees marked with an X.

Name	Attendance	Business/System Area	E-Mail	Phone (Work)
Beavers, Rosemary		FSA	Rosemary.Beavers@ed.gov	202.377.3126
Chauvin, Karen	X	FSA	Karen.Chauvin@ed.gov	202.377.4274
Eliadis, Pam	X	FSA	Pam.Eliadis@ed.gov	202.377.3554
Hill, Paul	X	FSA	<a href="mailto:Paul.Hill.JR@ed.gov">Paul.Hill.JR@ed.gov</a>	202.377.4323
Holman, Jane		FSA	Jane.Holman@ed.gov	202.377.4322
Hurt, Jay		FSA	John.Hurt@ed.gov	202.377.3453
Leith, Bill		FSA	William.Leith@ed.gov	202.377.3676
Meyers, Julie	X	Accenture	julie.m.meyers@accenture.com	202.962.0782
O'Hara, Diana	X	FSA	Diana.OHara@ed.gov	202.377.3466
Patton, Jason	X	Accenture	jason.m.patton@accenture.com	202.962.0712
Ragan, Dan		Accenture	daniel.p.ragan@accenture.com	703.947.4327
Rockis, Mike	X	FSA	Mike.Rockis@ed.gov	202.377.3540
Saunders, Jeanne		FSA	Jeanne.Saunders@ed.gov	202.377.3246
Vigna, Dwight		FSA	Dwight.Vigna@ed.gov	202.377.3436
White, Marge	X	FSA	Marge.White@ed.gov	202.377.3022
Wilson, Keith		FSA	Keith.Wilson@ed.gov	202.377.3591

## Topic 1: Data Quality Prioritization

**Presenter:** Julie Meyers

**Handouts:** Criteria Ranking Results Document; Criteria Question/ Answers Document; Prioritization Ranking Tool Diagram;



Key points/Decisions Made:

- The Data Quality criteria ranking results from the 4/20 meeting were reviewed and finalized. The criteria question/answer types and number scales were reviewed and modified. In addition, data quality issues 3 and 8 were prioritized using the MS Access tool. Reference meeting documentation for specifics.

Comments from the group:

- Delete customer service as a criterion and combine with visibility as a weighting factor.
- Change cost scale to the following ranges: 1) \$0-\$100,000; 2) \$100,000-\$500,000; 3) \$500,000-\$2,000,000; 4) >\$2,000,000. This point needs to be verified with Jane Holman.
- Change time scale to the following ranges: 1) 0 months - 6 months 2) 6 months - 1 year; 3) 1 year - 2 years; 4) >2 years. This point needs to be verified with Jane Holman.
- Changed the answer scales for the None/Low/Medium/High questions to 0/3/7/10.
- Changed the answer type for system integration criteria to None/Low/Medium/High.
- A point was raised to possibly use the criteria to prioritize against individual issues and use the additional weighting factors against the whole group of issues for further prioritization if necessary.
- Numerous reports were recommended to assist with analysis and prioritization of each data quality issue.

Issues:

N/A

## Action Items

Number	Action	Responsible	Date Assigned	Date Due	Status
DQ2	Define and identify difference between IQCU and IV&V	Jeanne Saunders, Dwight Vigna	2/27/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ5	Research to identify existing FSA Data Quality Tracking tools	Jane Holman, Jason Patton, Dan Ragan	04/13/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ6	Review and update criteria ratings	Steering Committee	04/20/04	4/27/04	Closed



## Next Meeting

- Date/Time: Tuesday, May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2004, 3:00PM - 4:30PM Room 64D1-2
- Topic: Prioritizing Data Quality Issues
- Presenter(s): Julie Meyers



**Meeting:** Data Quality Steering Committee Meeting - #6  
**Date:** May 4, 2004

## Objective

To continue prioritizing data quality issues using the Prioritization Tool in the Data Quality Issue Management tool.

## Agenda/ Attendees

The agenda items for this meeting were:

- Prioritize data quality issues

Invitees were as follows. Attendees marked with an X.

Name	Attendance	Business/System Area	E-Mail	Phone (Work)
Beavers, Rosemary		FSA	Rosemary.Beavers@ed.gov	202.377.3126
Chauvin, Karen		FSA	Karen.C Chauvin@ed.gov	202.377.4274
Eliadis, Pam	X	FSA	Pam.Eliadis@ed.gov	202.377.3554
Hill, Paul		FSA	<a href="mailto:Paul.Hill.JR@ed.gov">Paul.Hill.JR@ed.gov</a>	202.377.4323
Holman, Jane	X	FSA	Jane.Holman@ed.gov	202.377.4322
Hurt, Jay		FSA	John.Hurt@ed.gov	202.377.3453
Leith, Bill		FSA	William.Leith@ed.gov	202.377.3676
Meyers, Julie	X	Accenture	julie.m.meyers@accenture.com	202.962.0782
O'Hara, Diana	X	FSA	Diana.OHara@ed.gov	202.377.3466
Patton, Jason	X	Accenture	jason.m.patton@accenture.com	202.962.0712
Ragan, Dan		Accenture	daniel.p.ragan@accenture.com	703.947.4327
Rockis, Mike	X	FSA	Mike.Rockis@ed.gov	202.377.3540
Saunders, Jeanne		FSA	Jeanne.Saunders@ed.gov	202.377.3246
Vigna, Dwight		FSA	Dwight.Vigna@ed.gov	202.377.3436
White, Marge		FSA	Marge.White@ed.gov	202.377.3022
Wilson, Keith		FSA	Keith.Wilson@ed.gov	202.377.3591

## Topic 1: Data Quality Prioritization

**Presenter:** Julie Meyers

**Handouts:** Criteria Ranking Results Document; Data Quality Issue Management Summary Report (Reference 152.1.10a Appendix F Data Quality Summary Issue Report.rtf); Data Quality Prioritization Summary Report (Reference 152.1.10a Appendix H DQ Issue Prioritization Summary Report.rtf);



Key points/Decisions Made:

- Data quality issues 1, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 13/14 were prioritized using the MS Access tool. Reference meeting documentation for specifics.

Comments from the group:

- Changed criteria, “Could it corrupt financial statements/annual audit?” to “Could it negatively impact financial statements/annual audit?”
- Delete Quick Hit from the additional weighting factors.
- Verified cost and time scales with Jane Holman.
- Updated cost and time answers to >2 million and >2 years for Issues 3 and 8. In addition, updated system integration answer to high.
- Delete FMS from systems impacted for Issue 9.
- Combine Issues 13 and 14.
- Issue 7: The intention is for NSLDS to keep outstanding principal balance history from a future point in time going forward. FSA will not ask DL, Lenders, GAs, etc. to provide this historical information.
- Issue 9: The CSB demographics should be consolidated with COD and CPS during the FEBI implementation.
- Issue 19: Need clarification from Pam Eliadis whether Issue 19 is a duplicate of Issue 3.
- Issue 20: Jane Holman will follow-up with Tony Lang to determine if this issue has been resolved.
- Issue 22: Issue status has changed to Postponed. Dwight Vigna has confirmed that this issue will be resolved with the move towards Common Data Repository (CDR) within CSB. Target date for CSB CDR is October 2004.
- Issue 23: Issue status has changed to Postponed. A high level analysis to determine how FFEL data is reported in the Target State is currently being performed within Data Strategy 2.0. This analysis will define a recommended data flow, but will not resolve this issue in the short term.

Issues:

N/A



## Action Items

Number	Action	Responsible	Date Assigned	Date Due	Status
DQ2	Define and identify difference between IQCU and IV&V	Jeanne Saunders, Dwight Vigna	2/27/04	TBD	In Progress
DQ5	Research to identify existing FSA Data Quality Tracking tools	Jane Holman, Jason Patton, Dan Ragan	04/13/04	TBD	In Progress

## Next Meeting

- Date/Time: Tuesday, May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2004, 3:00PM - 4:30PM Room 64D1-2
- Topic: Prioritizing Data Quality Issues
- Presenter(s): Dan Ragan and Julie Meyers