



Query Repository View Enhancements (Project IUUN0020)

Financial Workgroup

June 16, 2003 - 149 ASTeCC - 3:00 – 4:30

ATTENDEES:

Dale Austin, Jayna Cheesman, Debra Claunch, Robert Garrett, Keith LaVey, Christine Levitt, Marilyn Lyons, Jennifer Miles, Sue Myers, Diane Skoll

PRESIDING:

Jayna Cheesman

PROJECT COORDINATOR:

Jayna Cheesman, Kathy Hamperian

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tasks in progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>HRS Security</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keith said the implementation was delayed due to some newly identified security issues which needed to be addressed. These have been resolved and Jayna and Kathy to recommend a time to implement the security. He would like to send a note to the listserv, notifying users of the proposed implementation date, and where to send details of any problems they may encounter. ▪ Keith said implementing the security involves changing the underlying tables to include a department number so they adhere to the mainframe security. These changes should not affect the users or the tools being used. ▪ Keith said they are trying to determine the best time to implement the changes with the least impact to the users. The last weekend in June 2003 has been suggested. ▪ <u>Metadata – element definitions</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keith said Lee Song is adding the basic information for Purchasing to the metadata. This will include the short description (title), synonym, and COBOL name. Eventually the map name (screen number) will be added, but this may be held until the ETL tool is implemented. ▪ Jayna said IT would begin implementing the naming standards to the Purchasing elements since no one is currently using this data. ▪ Diane asked if value-based security would be needed for the Purchasing data. Jayna said yes, since it is part of FRS. ▪ <u>Comparison of Brio and Crystal functionality</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna said Mike Carter would do a comparison of the desktop versions of Brio and Crystal during a joint meeting of the workgroups on July 7, 2003. ▪ Jayna indicated an RFP for the enterprise versions of the desktop tools would probably be done sometime in the next few months. She said IT has found that some functions available in the desktop version are not available in the enterprise versions or web-based versions. Dale asked about the versions reviewed and said the new versions may now be closer to the desktop versions. Jayna said they also need to determine if an enterprise version should only have enough functionality to handle pre-defined reports or does it need to handle all queries. ▪ <u>Change Requests</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna and Keith will be meeting on Friday mornings to set priorities for the change requests. Jayna said bugs, as a general rule, would be given a higher priority.

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna asked if the requirements documents for change requests are/should be posted on the web. Diane said at this time they are not. Keith said the auditors like to have these documents electronically and may also want to see signatures on paper copies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion Items 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Proposed standards for view names (handout)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jayna said the views in the Query Repository are currently prefaced with UK. They include the source system and _RPT to indicate they are used for reporting. She said she would like to preface views for data marts with DM or DW. ○ Jayna said the biggest distinction for users is knowing the Query Repository contains day old data from IDMS, but the data marts will contain snapshots of the data from IDMS after it has been cleansed. This could make a difference in how the data is reported. Data in the marts or warehouse will be pulled from a lot of systems and include snapshots over time. This data will be used for trend analysis, and comparisons from year to year. ○ Keith said the location of the data could help with this distinction. The data for the QR and the data marts could be housed on different servers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACTION: A designator for the views in the Query Repository, data warehouse and data marts is needed, but it doesn't matter what they are, only that they are easily distinguished. • <u>Changing process for establishing standards.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jayna said the process for establishing standards has changed. Initially IT was going to have the users select the prime words, class words and abbreviations from the lists compiled from various sources and then apply these to the elements. ○ The new process involves 1) IT starting with the elements in the views, 2) assigning prime words, class words and qualifiers/modifiers, to create the Logical Names, 3) presenting the Logical Names to the users for review and changes, 4) IT proposing the abbreviated or new column names, 5) presenting the new View Column Names to the users for review and changes, 6) implementing the new Column Names in the views. ○ Jayna said it is important to start with the prime word in an alphabetical list so most of the data related to a particular subject area is found together. The proposed turn-around for each review on these view changes is two (2) days. Dale said they will try to work with this schedule but it may be difficult since this is year-end. ○ Diane asked how people feel about abbreviations. She said some tool windows are small and having the abbreviations helps select the elements. The group agreed with this. ○ <u>View priorities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna asked Dale what the priorities should be for FRS data. ▪ The priorities are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1) SL\$ • 2) GL\$ • 3) Transaction files • 4) Grants ▪ Jayna said after the element names are converted, users will have to redo their queries. However, IT will offer a service to convert the queries if the users wish. • <u>Abbreviations</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Root word and USPS (United States Postal Service)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna said in reviewing the abbreviations from other institutions, there are two recommendations (samples

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>listed on the Agenda):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1) All words with the same root word should use the same abbreviation. • 2) Use abbreviations similar to the USPS guidelines which primarily remove the vowels and are easier to distinguish word variations. These guidelines were used in the Purchasing Vendor cleanup. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jayna said she prefers that singular and plural versions of a word use the same abbreviation. ▪ The group feels following the USPS guidelines will lead users to the end much quicker. Dale said he would be interested in seeing how new users work with the different versions, but feels the USPS guidelines will make more sense. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION: Deb will put the master list of abbreviations on the web site so users can see the proposed UK standard and the various proposals from other sources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>ACCT view element names</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>CLASS – Flag versus Code</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna said in reviewing the ACCT view element names, Deb has found some inconsistencies in the names and descriptions. • Jayna indicated a ‘flag’ infers the element is binary or limited to two values such as, yes/no, true/false, 0/1, etc. She said there is no consistency in the use of ‘flag’ within IDMS, but within the warehouse she would like to try for this consistency. The only caveat is if an element is defined as a flag and it is determined that additional values are required later, the element may have to be changed to ‘code’. • General discussion said to go with the true definitions of flag and code when assigning the element names. ▪ <u>SL/GL as part of Logical Name</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna said she would prefer that if an element is not specifically SL or GL only, she would like to remove the SL or GL from the element name. She thinks these can be misleading. • Dale and Jennifer explained the element could have one value in the SL and the same or another value in the GL, but they are the same element. All SL data is separate from GL data. They feel having the SL and GL designation adds value to show where the data comes from. • Jayna asked if it would be okay to remove the underscore between S_L and G_L, and the group agreed this would be okay. ▪ <u>Digits 1-6, Digits 7-10, Digits 1-2</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna asked if the ‘digits’ designation could be removed from the element names and replaced with the ‘English’ names. For instance Digit 1 is the ‘ledger’, Digit 1-6 is the ‘account’, Digit 7-10 is the ‘object code’. • Dale said there is no ‘English’ name for Digits 7-9, or Digits 6-8 and feels this designation needs to be kept to facilitate reporting. ▪ <u>S L REVIEW 0000, S-L DESC 0000</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jayna asked what the ‘0000’ designation means. Jennifer said it indicates the data is at the 6-digit account level. It is used when applying ABR rules, delete flags, drop flags, etc. When applied at

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>the 6-digit account level, the system propagates the changes to all object codes (10-digit accounts) associated with this 6-digit account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If something doesn't add value to the element name, it can be removed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Naming standards, Prime words</u> ▪ Jayna asked if there was any account data not associated with the SL or GL. Dale said transactions and open commitment records. These are not separated in different tables, but the SL or GL does not flow through. ▪ General discussion about the prime word 'Account'. Jennifer feels a prime word Account and qualifier _SL will be more confusing than a prime word SL_Account. Since the elements in SL and GL are in separate tables is it necessary to have this designation. ▪ Jayna said if the definitions are the same, the element names should be the same. Dale, using the Indirect Cost Code as an example, said the definition is the same, but the values in the edit tables for SL and GL could either be the same or could be different. Having the designation helps distinguish where the data is coming from. ▪ Diane suggested getting feedback from a larger group of users, since today's group was relatively small. ▪ Jayna asked about the distinctions between Account and Purchasing data, and what the major prime word should be. Dale said Purchasing is part of FRS. ▪ Jayna said one example could be Student Accounts Record or Accounts Student Record and said the trend is for the source of the data to be the higher primary subject area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACTION: Jayna will check the source documentation from the other institutions to see if SL or GL are part of the prime word. (9/17/03 The University of Arizona does have a prime word/phrase for General Ledger, but not Subsidiary Ledger.) ▪ Dale said FS9 and FG9 elements infer the element is a 10-digit dollar record and this needs to be specified as part of the element name. If it is a 6-digit account record, the digit designation can be left off. ▪ The SL and GL signify there is a corresponding element in the other table and should be part of the element names. Element names without the SL or GL designator indicate there is not a corresponding element in the other table. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACTION: Diane will create a spreadsheet of the SL and GL record definitions so a comparison of SL and GL elements can be made. (Completed 6/17/03.) ▪ ACTION: Deb will compare the SL and GL records to determine which should include the SL/GL designation and which should not. ▪ ACTION: Deb will look at the FRS OCT Requirements Document to identify elements that are not in use. Logical names will be assigned to these elements but their use in views (other than views for IT staff) may be limited. An "In Use/Not In Use" flag will be added to the logical name spreadsheet for review by the users.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ June 30, 2003 (Monday) at 3:00, Room 149 ASTeCC