

NFPORS CONFERENCE CALL 10-23-03

R-1 Betty Blocker  
R-2 Elise Bowne  
R-3 Susan Lee  
R-4 Scott Tobler  
R-5 Christie Neal  
R-6 Mary Ann Sanford, Bill Fish, John Orbeton  
R-9 Janice Hancock  
Peter Bedker, Jeff Waalkes

**The database will be locked on November 1, 2003 at 12:00 AM.** Accomplishment areas, which are the Treatments and Activity screens, will be locked. We can still modify the Treatment Unit and Project areas. Requests to modify data after lockdown will be approved by Janet Anderson-Tyler or a designee to determine if changes are necessary. Edits of locked data will be done by the database administrator.

A major change will be coming to NFPORS in November. We are going away from the generic funding sources. It will be replaced with agency specific job codes. There are about 160 job codes for the Forest Service. There will be a procedure to have default values show up, with the ability to pull down the full suite of job codes that are in FFIS. This will allow for secondary benefits including trust funds to be selected.

We will be getting WO direction on what goes in FACTS and what will go in NFPORS. There will be a bridge between the two, but Peter does not know when that will occur. We will get WO direction for FY 04 on what accomplishments to capture in NFPORS. We will also get WO direction on how to deal with Condition Class changes and use of Stewardship contracts.

The reason that NFPORS shows reporting accomplishments by year at the treatment level is because DOI is allowed to report accomplishments across fiscal years. On FS contracts, we show the accomplishment when the contract is awarded, and we show force account accomplishments when the work is done in the field. FS spin....we have no business rule to allow us to span accomplishments over a period of years. Carryover is remixed, and does not span years. So, the FS will not use this feature.

Quality Assurance (QA) portal discussion. There is pressure for high attainment. If we have no final condition class on contracted treatments, we have to enter an anticipated final condition class, or a QA error is generated when we show the contract awarded (project completed). We should not be anticipating condition class, so direction should be coming out. Further discussion concerned why we need to enter condition classes for intermediate treatments, (such as thinning, which is part of a thin, pile, and burn project) anyway. If the condition class remains the same on these intermediate treatments, we get a negative because we did not change the condition class, it stayed the same. We may need to change the QA report to only show those final treatments requiring the pre and

post condition classes. This is a work load issue. If there is not change to the condition class, why report it. Further discussion will occur with the WO.

The three rules for condition class are as follows:

1. Planned condition class observation has no entry. The planned initiation date for the treatment must be less than or equal to the pretreatment condition class observation date.
2. With an accomplished treatment, the actual pretreatment condition class observation must be less than or equal to the actual initiation date.
3. With a post-treatment accomplishment, the post-treatment condition class observation date must be greater than or equal to the actual completion date.

Round Robin Questions:

Are the regions entering planned post-treatment condition classes for contracts? Region 3 is entering them; all other regions had not discussed this yet.

1. How do we show funded verses unfunded projects?

Don't enter the Obligation FY data field until the project is funded. Once accomplishments are reported, the QA portal shows an error if there is no Obligation FY. Force Account has little relevance to the Fiscal Obligation year. The Obligation FY is to be used when a project is funded.

2. QA is looking at other than FY 03 and FY 04 projects.

That is correct. Some of the QA rules look at the old NFPInfo information that came across. Specifically, QA looks at the treatment unit info such as Condition class, fire regimes, and lat/longs because the treatment units can be used over and over again. A discussion on who the QA reports are for needs to occur. Peter felt the QA was supposed to provide feedback to the users on data quality. It is being used for other purposes it appears. If you have old data that is creating QA problems, document this and move on. The business rules may need to be changed for the old data. For the most part however, even in the old data, fire regime and condition class (FRCC) should be cleaned up. There are a lot of add hoc reports run on FRCC to show trends.

3. There was another discussion on treatment units.

Peter will send out a FAQ paper that should help. If you have several treatments over a 4 year period, you will have to change treatment units every year. If you do several treatments within one year, they can add up to the total treatment unit size in the one year. But any treatments the next year on the same piece of ground will need a new treatment unit.

4. If anyone anticipates having trouble getting all of their FY 03 in the database before Oct 31, let Jeff Waalkes know.

5. States can be allowed access to the NFPORS dashboard.

6. Is it possible to set a filter on the QA so that it only picks up one FY?

This may be possible on some of the QA items.

7. Where do partners enter data? The states will be entering data at some point in time. The counties probably will not. There will be discussion on when and what data the states should enter at the State Fire Assistance meeting in Tucson in November. The Coop Fire folks in the region will work with the states to see who enters the data. VFA will be entered as Community Assistance, and the SFA actual on the ground treatments will be entered in Hazardous Fuels by the states and/or regions.

8. 2002 is not on the dashboard because DOI was not in NFPIInfo.

Neither is the 2001 info. Use the Performance Report for any numbers you need for 2001 or 2002. Peter has a dataset for 2001 and 2002, and will work on making them available on the dashboard.

9. On the dashboard, the question was asked if they could change the (blank) to a 0 (zero) instead. Peter will ask.

10. State numbers are in the dashboard on appendix K.

11. A question was raised if Doug Shaw was entering BAER info nationally. Peter did not know this. It was questioned if condition class was really needed for BAER work. Peter felt Fire Regime was still important, but maybe not condition class.

The next NFPORS conference call will be on November 20, 2003 at 1300 ET. If you can't make it, send Peter your questions ahead of time, and he will answer them on the call.