Query Repository View Enhancements (Project IUUN0020)
Financial Workgroup
March 24, 2003 - Hardymon Alltel Room - 3:00 – 4:30

ATTENDEES: Dale Austin, Frank Abraham, Angela Back, Debra Claunch, Jonathan Clifton, Paula Cox, Penny Cox, Chris Donahoe, Kathy Hamperian, Courtney Higdon, Jeanne Hurak, Jenell Johnson, Keith LaVey, Christine Levitt, Gary Lindle, Marilyn Lyons, Angie Martin, Jennifer Miles, Sue Myers, Kandi Neal, Kathee Norris, Debbie O'Daniel, Gina O'Dea, Trish Polly, Barry Rankin, Stephen Shackelford, Alan Shepherd, Chris Shotwell, Diane Skoll, Lana Spicer, Lu Wang, Scott Wood
GUESTS: Doyle Friskney
PRESIDING: Kathy Hamperian
PROJECT COORDINATOR: Jayna Cheesman, Kathy Hamperian

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
• **Security Decisions**	▪ Kathy introduced herself. She introduced Doyle Friskney, the Associate VP for IT; Keith LaVey, the manager of the Infrastructure; Diane Skoll, an IT analyst; and Deb Claunch, recorder. ▪ **ACTION: Deb will send a meeting reminder to the listserv prior to each meeting.** ▪ Kathy explained IT needs to hear from the users regarding the Query Repository dumps of IDMS data. The purpose of the workgroups is to try to hit the widest range of concerns up-front. These are copies of the IDMS data in an Oracle database. The system is updated incrementally on a nightly basis, and rebuilt as needed. To expedite the move from Sybase and FOCUS, the views from Sybase and FOCUS were duplicated in the Query Repository. Another purpose of the workgroup is to determine how to make the Query Repository more useful for users with the proper access and security. ▪ Kathy said Sybase had department level security and if you had access to FOCUS you had access to everything. She said discussions with the Data Stewards, area security liaisons, Dale Austin and Don Witt, indicated that department level security should be implemented in the Data Warehouse/Query Repository for FRS, HRS, and FES. Kathy said account level security is not available in the Data Warehouse/Query Repository environment. She said security will be copied from mainframe security and a mainframe account will be required before a user can access the Query Repository. Currently, IT is working on implementing security in the Query Repository for HRS and this should be completed in 3 to 4 weeks. SIS security will be based on Academic Unit. ▪ Chris Donahoe said some areas such as CPMD have access to all 7-ledger accounts, and RGS has access to certain departments. She asked how security for these areas would be handled. Kathy said they would probably be given global access to start with. ▪ Kathy said IT is aware of the concerns of opening up security in the Data Warehouse/Query Repository environment, so they have decided not to grant any new access until security for FRS and HRS is completed. ▪ There is a process in place to request access to the Query Repository. Dale Austin is redesigning the form used to request access to FRS and HRS to include Query Repository access. The form will be available at:

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	http://www.uky.edu/FiscalAffairs/Shared/Forms/frshrspurch.pdf
• **Current Problems, Listserv, Web site**	▪ Kathy said if people were having problems with the Query Repository, they should bring them to the workgroup or use the listservs as resources. Perhaps someone else has encountered the problem and will be able to help with the solution. Kathy explained the purpose of the various listservs: ▪ UKWHERY@lsv.uky.edu is a listserv for everyone with access to the Query Repository. This list currently has about 200 people on the list. ▪ REPORTING-L@lsv.uky.edu is a listserv used to contact the Query Repository triage team for assistance and support or to report problems. ▪ WEBFOCUS-L@lsv.uky.edu is a listserv for everyone with access to WebFOCUS. ▪ WFSUPPORT-L@lsv.uky.edu is a listserv used to contact the WebFOCUS triage team for assistance and support ▪ QRVE-FINANCIAL@lsv-uky.edu is the listserv established for the Query Repository View Enhancements Financial Workgroup. ▪ Kathy said the reporting web site: https://reporting.uky.edu/ has links to post problems, information about updates to the systems, information for downloading the Oracle client, dictionaries of the data, etc.
• **Report Requirements Discussion**	▪ Kathy asked if there were any concerns that needed to be put on the table. ▪ Trish said there are currently three views of data in the Query Repository, RPT, ACCESS and SYB. Kathy said this is true, RPT contains all the fields from FRS, ACCESS view which is a limited view of the fields based on value-based security (departmental views of the Sybase views), and SYB that is a copy of SYBASE. Keith said the SYB view is a replication of what the data looked like in Sybase. Kathy said the goal is to eliminate additional views and move everyone to using the RPT views, which will eventually have security built into the views and additional information. ▪ Kathy said https://reporting.uky.edu will eventually have a cross reference between the various views to aid the users in identifying elements. IT is in the process of building this cross-reference now. ▪ Kathy said she would like to use the workgroup to help identify common names to identify the elements/fields, and the elements/fields they map to in IDMS. ▪ Chris Donahoe said you couldn't share reports with others if you don't have access to the same views. Kathy said it is a nightmare for IT to manage the multiple views. She said the transition to the RPT views would be slow. IT wants to implement as many changes as necessary in the beginning to cut down on the impact to users and the possibilities of having to re-write existing reports. ▪ Keith LaVey said all the views are being documented on https://reporting.uky.edu, although not all views have descriptions of the individual elements at this time. Kathy demonstrated that by selecting a view from the **DATA VIEWS** on the web site, the different view names and descriptions could be seen. Not all of these are complete at this time. Drilling down by selecting a View Name will give you a list of the elements/fields and descriptions. Not all element descriptions are available at this time but IT is working on completing this. ▪ A document that tells the manner in which a person requests Query Repository access will be put up on the reporting web site soon. Dale has reworked his Access Request form for FRS/HRS/FES to include access to the Query Repository. ▪ Someone asked how much data was available. Kathy said there were transactions, by fiscal year, available back to 1994. ▪ Gary asked how long the old and new naming conventions would be supported. Kathy said IT had hoped to be moving to an ERP system by now. This would have helped standardize terminology across the systems. In the meantime, the Query Repository will have to accommodate the different naming conventions as much as possible. Kathy said that as

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION

	Jayna builds the data marts, standardization would be a part of the data marts. She said some queries would have to rewritten. IT will assist users in some cases and will keep users engaged while making decisions.
	▪ Trish said there are about 40+ departments within the Medical Center and each will be doing reports on their own. She said most of these users had not used any report tool and would need education and training. She asked where the training would come from? Kathy said that Jayna is in the process of determining what tools are currently being used on campus. Part of the spreadsheet initially sent to the Administrative Computing Users, asked them to identify the report tools they are currently using or plan to use in the future. Kathy said IT is hoping to endorse tools that have been standardized and will be supported by IT. Currently users are using Brio, MS Access, MS Excel, Crystal, Infomaker, SAS, etc. Training for the supported tools could possibly be offered by Tony DeLucia's group. She said IT Training Services (http://www.uky.edu/IT/Training/) is currently offering training on some of these tools. Kathy said the hardest part will not necessarily be training on a tool, but training on the data. She said it is hard for IT to understand what a user needs and what fields to recommend for reporting. She said a lot of this understanding should come from FRS and HRS training.
	▪ Dale said users should think about the data they are seeing on the screens to help decide what they want to report on. The next thing is to think about the timeframes you want to examine (i.e. last month, this month, last year, this year, etc.). He said FRS has about 4,000 to 5,000 data elements, but most users only use 1,500 to 2,000.
	▪ Kathee Norris said she uses Brio and had a hard time learning the tool since she does not have a programming background. She asked if Excel and Access would provide the same data? Kathy H. said that Brio and Crystal provide the ability to do complex queries, and she is not sure if this can be duplicated in Excel or Access. She said Excel and Access are best suited for someone not crossing fiscal years or departments, someone doing simple queries. Dale said OCT moved from Infomaker to Crystal. He said Infomaker was not as efficient for the needs of OCT. He said it should be sufficient for someone only having to do 3 to 4 reports per year.
	▪ Penny said there are three levels of users:
	  ▪ Single account or view which could be viewed using Excel or Access
	  ▪ College or sector views (across multiple entities) which can be viewed using Crystal, Brio or Infomaker
	  ▪ Enterprise wide views (aggregates and drilldowns) which can be viewed with SAS or data mining tools for statistics and deviations
	▪ She said a user should find the tool to match what they are trying to do. Kathy said IT would not be able to support every product. Their recommendations will try to be as broad as possible for the largest group of users.
	▪ Someone said the colleges should be fine with Excel or Crystal for most purposes. Excel does have a limitation in that a spreadsheet can only hold so much data. Excel is free under the campus Microsoft agreement and is a good tool to start with. Most agreed that Excel should be sufficient at the department level.
	▪ General discussion on the costs of the various tools:
	  ▪ Brio 6.6 Explorer is about $1,259.25 per seat, and the enterprise version is required.
	  ▪ Crystal Reports 8.5 Developer Edition is about $481.00, and is one version back from the current version
	  ▪ Infomaker is $195.00 per seat and allows you to build sub-files.
	  ▪ SAS for Internal Admin Annual License, Stores Stk #7433-8972, is $180.00 per seat.
	  ▪ SAS for Windows Annual License, Stores Stk #7433-8974, is $85.00 per seat.
	    ▪ Prices were verified 3/25/03. Quantity or academic discounts may be available.
	▪ Kathy said any changes to the current views could affect the queries users have already written.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	▪ Dale said the users would like IT to make a decision on the tools. He said sometimes it comes to personal preference or money. He would like IT to make a choice per tier and pursue getting site licenses for the institution. Penny said the problem with site licenses is that the vendors want the institution to pay for all employees whether or not they will be using the tool. Doyle agreed that IT has not put a stake in the ground yet. He said a site license for MS Desktop was an easy decision. He said it looks like SAS is the tool of choice for the high-end user and academic users. He said it looks like the decision for intermediate users needs to be made. He said IT has pursued this issue with Gartner and they are coming down on the side of Crystal, since they are a solvent company. Kathy said once the tools are standardized, all old reports would be dead and the user would have to start over if their tool had changed. ▪ Gary asked if the connectivity is available to support off-site users as well? Doyle said this should not be an issue. He said if the question was could a license be used on a home computer, the answer is yes. It is possible the user would have to upgrade their home computer or connections. ▪ Gary said he currently has IDs and passwords for Unix, CMA, MVS, Outlook, Exchange, Oracle, SAS, etc. He asked if a single sign-on would ever be available? Kathy said some of these systems are out of the control of IT. She said IT is moving towards password synchronization for the systems (mainframe, Query Repository, email) under their control. She said Oracle and Microsoft don't currently interact together well. She said IT would be expanding password synchronization to include department systems when possible. Another issue that must be dealt with is the use of multi-user IDs. ▪ Kathee Norris said she would like to have a list of the users for a particular tool to use for networking. ▪ **ACTION: Deb will work with Jayna to produce a list of report tool users.** ▪ Lana said DATS is a system in the Medical Center used for encumbering and expensing. It is supposed to be pulling down information from FRS and HRS, but the new package is not doing this now. She said users should be able to combine this information with information obtained from the Query Repository. Kathy said IT had hoped this data would have been part of an ERP system. She said the Medical Center might want to consider adding this data to the Query Repository. ▪ Doyle asked if the bigger problem is understanding the fields or training of tools? Trish said since IT wants to pass the power of reporting down to the users that training is a large issue. People don't understand what's out there. Kathy H. asked if a separate class in reporting is needed to help identify the fields users want to get to. ▪ Chris D. said you could link a spreadsheet in Excel to a view in FRS and report off of both. She said OCT has been doing this for their financial statements. Lana said DATS can be downloaded to Excel and linked to data in the Query Repository. ▪ Gary said training is an issue. He said the training should be coordinated with the system, the elements behind the system and how to get them out. He said technology is moving forward faster than it was 10 years ago. Kathy said this is an institutional need, not and IT issue. She said resources are needed to provide training. She said IT calls the system owners for answers, just like the users do. She said the workgroups are a start on where to begin for training and support. ▪ Kathy said it's important to know what your question is, what problem you are trying to solve. Then talk to the business owners about what fields to use. ▪ Someone asked if a table existed for HRS or FRS identifying the table elements and descriptions, anything to tell you what this element is. There was such a list for SIS at one time. This list is currently outdated. Keith said the dictionary is not available online as these documents are not final. IT will be looking at the source and putting these on the Reporting

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	web site. He said these are similar to the IDMS dictionaries and IT is trying to get information down to the element level. ▪ Penny asked if another opportunity would be available for users to tell what fields they would like to have in views? Kathy said the workgroup is the forum for doing this. Penny said for many of the reports she has to run, the Account Title must be linked to the ACCT table. She asked if there was any way to add the Account Title element to the ACCT table to avoid linking. Kathy said views could be created to accommodate these types of issues. Kathy said the underlying table structures would not be changed, but views could be created to do this linking in the background. Kathy said these suggestions should be voiced in the workgroup meetings or sent to QRVE-Financial@lsv.uky.edu. ▪ Trish said she sometimes links to a view to pull the department name into a query. The data that is returned is 10 times what she expected. She asked how to avoid this multiplication. Someone suggested that if she includes the fiscal year in her joins this might stop the multiplication of data. Keith said this sometimes happens because the account month is now included in the views and it wasn't available before. He said if common threads like this can be identified, IT can do joins behind the scenes for the users. ▪ Gary said the users want to know what the records contain. Kathy said IT would continue to keep the users updated on the element definitions and view layouts.
•	▪ Kathy asked the users to start thinking about the type of problems they are having, the types of questions they have and are trying to answer, and to have these for discussion at the next meeting.
• **Next Meeting**	▪ **April 7, 2003 (Monday) at 3:00 in the Alltel Room (Hardymon Building – corner of Rose and Maxwell)**