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1 Executive Summary

IM QuickScan is a tool populated with a number of questions to assess an organisation's level of information maturity. The web-based version is currently focused on assessing current-state levels of information maturity against an assumed optimal state.

The Information Maturity Model (IMM) is at the core of the MIKE2.0 approach to assessing Data Governance levels within an organisation. The IMM was initially defined by the MetaGroup and proposes five levels of maturity that an organization may be assessed at based on their information management practices. The MIKE2.0 Methodology used this base model as a starting point to create the Information Maturity assessment.

This web-based version of IM QuickScan contains approximately 175 Capability Statements that are used to gain insight into an organisation's maturity levels for Data Governance. Capability Statements are organized into Data Management Areas (e.g. Enterprise Awareness), which are used to group questions regarding a particular area. Questions are organised into groups to ensure that the assessment covers the full breadth of information maturity. Use of this model is meant to provide an information-oriented equivalent to the Capability Maturity Model (CMM), which is used to assess an enterprise’ software development maturity level.

On completion of the assessment, an automated report is generated that shows the user's answers across each of the 6 major dimensions: People/Organisation, Policy, Practice, Compliance, Technology and Measurement. This report is used as input into other tasks in the MIKE2.0 Methodology.

The current web-based version of IM QuickScan has more limited functionality that the initial excel-based version. It is expected that the web-based version of IM QuickScan will be extended in the future to include additional functionality. More information on IM QuickScan can be found on its MIKE2.0 Methodology wiki page.

Score
51.60

The chart below represents the overall capability levels assessed across the 6 dimensions of IM QuickScan.
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2 People/Organisation

The **People/Organisation** dimension measures Data Governance levels across several areas. Assessment questions are used to determine whether the correct skills are in place, whether the organisation is modelled in the appropriate fashion and if the business goals properly align with how the organisation has been defined from a personnel perspective.

The goal is to move to an organisation that is optimised for Information Development. One of the key concepts of the MIKE2.0 Methodology is that of Enterprise Views and the need to provide a balanced view of the enterprise across "vertical pillars" that relate the business and the "horizontal" Technology Backplane of information and infrastructure. This means that operations carried out across the Technology Backplane support business priorities by getting these capabilities "in front" of new business requirements. The goal from an organizational perspective will be to move to some form of a central model across the Technology Backplane, to complement business models in the areas that have the highest degrees of shared elements. Opportunities will also exist to optimise resources through a hybrid model that combines centralised and distributed resources –the most effective organisational model may not require full centralisation.
Data Governance Practices extend across several areas. Implementation of these best practices is critical to ensuring a comprehensive approach to how information is managed across the organisation. These practices apply to areas such as data capture, use of technology standards, interactions with customers and delivery methods.

Moving to an Information Development approach means the full implementation of best practices across the enterprise. The MIKE2.0 Methodology provides best practices through the set of tasks in the Overall Implementation Guide as well as through detailed Supporting Assets and Solutions. Organisations that are immature in their practices should try and improve them in an evolutionary fashion, focusing on implementation of an initial set of Foundation Capabilities before moving on to move advanced concepts.
Data Governance Policies provide strategic and operational direction to the enterprise through a framework for decision-making about how data will be managed. Data Governance policies recognise that corporate data is a critical resource and will be managed as such. An initial set of Guiding Principles drive policies.

In the MIKE2.0 Methodology, Data Governance Policies are initially set during the Technology Assessment and Selection Blueprint and are then reviewed periodically for their effectiveness through activities focused on continuous improvement. Therefore, there is a clear target for moving to an optimal approach for Information Development. These policies do change over time, but these changes are infrequent. Changes to policies may be required due to new business requirements, ineffectiveness of existing policies or changes to technology.
5 Compliance

The **Data Governance Compliance** dimension helps assess how well an organisation is prepared to meet targets provided largely from industry and external regulators. Audits are often used to gather this information and are typically conducted by an external group as opposed to the internal Data Governance team.

Moving to an optimal Data Governance organisation for Compliance means that your initiatives related to Compliance are aligned to strategic goals around delivery of new business capabilities. The MIKE2.0 Methodology recommends audits be conducted as part of a continuous improvement programme and should form an objective measure for assessing enterprise maturity. Organisations taking an Information Development approach can then view Compliance initiatives as a means to gain a strategic advantage over competitors as opposed to merely a cost. The strategic approach defined through MIKE2.0 allows organisations to align their Compliance initiatives so that common activities across the Technology Backplane are conducted in the most efficient fashion.
6 Measurement

Data Governance Metrics provide the information quality objectives that the organisation plans to achieve. Just like other business performance measures, metrics should be managed and tracked at the executive level. Metrics are created by either executives or data stewards with input from data analysts. They are often directly related to Compliance targets.

In MIKE2.0, measurements are conducted throughout the execution of the methodology. Objective information is used for survey-based measurements whereas data profiling and monitoring is used for assessing detailed data. These measurements provide valuable insight into information quality issues in existing information assets. However, they measure only the symptoms and do not provide significant insight into the root cause of poor quality data. Instead, measurement results need to be examined and root-cause analysis performed. Organisations taking an Information Development approach use their measurement results as input into an improvement programme for their practices, policies, technology implementation and organisational model.
7 Technology

The **Technology** dimension measures Data Governance in relation to the requirements, design, architecture and implementation of technology systems. It is focused on measuring technology capabilities and how they have been implemented. When moving to the strategic architecture, it is important to get foundation capabilities in place as a starting point before moving to more advanced capabilities.

Moving to an optimal model for Information Development means that the technology environment provides the flexibility and reuse required for contemporary business problems. It also means moving to an architecture based on open and common standards. Reduced complexity through standardisation of product sets, delivery of common services, improved data quality, software re-factoring and progressive automation are also key features in an Information Development approach. The Blueprinting phases of MIKE2.0 are focused on defining the strategic technology environment that will be implemented over time, allowing for tactical implementations to be aligned with the strategic technology vision.
8 Conclusion Section

Now that the assessment is complete, you should use these results to help set a vision for your Data Governance programme. You should review your overall score and determine if the ratings assigned to your organisation are aligned with the descriptions below.

- **Level 1 Data Governance Organisation – Aware.** An Aware Data Governance Organisation knows that the organisation has issues around Data Governance but is doing little to respond to these issues. Awareness has typically come as the result of some major issues that have occurred that have been Data Governance-related. An organisation may also be at the Aware state if they are going through the process of moving to state where they can effectively address issues, but are only in the early stages of the programme.

- **Level 2 Data Governance Organisation – Reactive.** A Reactive Data Governance Organisation is able to address some of its issues, but not until some time after they have occurred. The organisation is not able to address root causes or predict when they are likely to occur. "Heroes" are often needed to address complex data quality issues and the impact of fixes done on a system-by-system level are often poorly understood.

- **Level 3 Data Governance Organisation – Proactive.** A Proactive Data Governance Organisation can stop issues before they occur as they are empowered to address root cause problems. At this level, the organisation also conducts ongoing monitoring of data quality issues to ensure that issues are resolved quickly.

- **Level 4 Data Governance Organisation – Managed.** A Managed Data Governance Organisation has a mature set of information management practices. This organisation is not only able to proactively identify issues and address them, but defines its strategic technology direction in a manner focused on Information Development.

- **Level 5 Data Governance Organisation – Optimal.** An Optimal Data Governance Organisation is also referred to as the Information Development Centre of Excellence. In this model, Information Development is treated as a core competency across strategy, people, process, organisation and technology.

If you in the process of conducting the Organisational QuickScan Assessment within the MIKE2.0 Methodology, you will use the output of these results as input into other tasks used to form the overall Business and Technology Blueprint. IM QuickScan output feeds directly into MIKE2.0 tasks related to assessing the Economic Value of Information, defining a Strategic Architecture and improving enterprise-wide Data Governance.

The web-based version of MIKE2.0 currently only captures a current-state assessment and does not capture information such as target assessment level, weightings or interviewee comments. You may find that you may also want to capture this information as part of your assessment as well as compare the results from multiple users into an aggregate result-set.

If you conducting this assessment independent from the MIKE2.0 Methodology and feel that you want to improve Data Governance levels as a result of the assessment, you can find the open source version of the MIKE2.0 Methodology at www.openmethodology.org.