Minutes from NFPORS Q&A Teleconference for BLM
June 3, 2003

Present:
Russ Berry, Sandy Gregory (NV), Pat Moore (BLM), Kim VanHemelryck (ID), Krista Waid (ID), Veronica Edwards (AZ), Bob Means (WY), Karen Michaud (NM), Kato Howard (AK), and Donna Hummel (CA)

This is the first of a series of such conferences. The approach is to answer questions about the use of NFPORS in a round-robin style.

In the course of the call it was decided to schedule the calls every two weeks.

1. Are User Guides available?
Newly DRAFTED User Guides are being reviewed for all three keypoints. A web site is being set up that will provide them to the NFPORS community. That site will be reached from nfpors.gov (prior to login.) The documents will include a new NFPORS glossary and Russ requests that everyone provide comments back on all the DRAFT documents.
2. Does "Prep-Feet" still show up in the Unit-level DCT-portlet reports?
Russ thought that this problem was already resolved, but he will confirm. He also asked that such problems be documented by users using screen dumps.
3. Is there a way to set up user accounts so that individuals have access to multiple units/regions/agencies?
Russ said that he would add this modification to the existing change request. The modification is to add "agencies" to the request. SCR #123 is already approved for multiple units/regions. The release is not yet identified. This is part of a complex issue that is being worked.
4. A user has experience problems using the Management Dashboard's Brio tool for Ad Hoc reports.
Some W95 users have experienced problems. Others have apparently had trouble if they already have Brio installed on their systems. These problems are isolated and may be resolved by contacting your local IT support service.
5. A recommendation was made to set up an ad hoc report training session.
Russ will do that.
6. A recommendation was made to include Category/Type in canned WUI reports.
Russ will add that to the change request list. An SCR already is in place (#143) that would produce a detailed portal report of Treatments (and separately, Activities).
7. Does the "Unit Project Report" (DCT/canned) allow you to show multiple years?
It does not right now, but you can change the FY for the report at the top of the page.
8. Is there a way to show "contributed funds?"
This is a known issue. Russ is working with the OWFC and FS to determine NFPORS' response to items that are non-NFP in scope. It is likely that changes will be made that will track contributed funds but the mechanism is not yet designed.
9. When can we track TU by owner?

That capability is now in place with the release of v 1.5. TU owners include: federal, state, municipal, county, private and tribal.

10. When can we simply copy Treatments and Activities?

SCR 11 is scheduled for release in version 1.5.2. That translates to the end of June.

11. What about that annoying problem of losing the Treatment Type if you get an error after trying to save a Treatment?

This is a know issue and there is no easy solution. There is no approved SCR to fix this problem. It results from our effort to design a straight html interface.

12. Will there be canned reports for the CA module?

Yes. They are being designed right now. If there is something that you want to see, please let Russ or Al Murphey know.

13. In Alaska there are TUs that are so big that it is impossible to correctly only one Fire Regime. What can be done?

This is new. Russ does not have a good answer except that perhaps multiple TUs could be entered. This is not an acceptable solution. The issue is tabled until someone else could address it.

14. In Alaska, the GIS data layers are either missing or inadequate for precisely defining the TU location. What can be done?

Kato will provide any insight that he has regarding what GIS layers could be added to the tool. He should try to identify the specific layers and determine their availability.

15. The numbers for Units do not accurately sum to the same data that is shown on the Region (State) reports.

This is a known issue and the contractor is addressing it. It is complex and is related to the issue of constraining Treatments and Activities to one and only one FY.
Version 1.4.4 made this a requirement for all future (from then on) Treatments and Activities but there is legacy data that was not subject to that business rule.

16. Administrators need to see what users have what read/write accesses in what modules.

An SCR has now been submitted that will provide this capability in an Administrator report.

17. Is there any way that the Administrators could get requests only for keypoints for which they have authority?

An SCR has now been submitted that will change the process. Administrators will be tagged for their various keypoints and messages will only be sent to those whose responsibility includes the requested keypoint.