

RESULTS - Live Meeting

Operational Issue Forum “top 10”/Question and Answer

by Darren Bonar (FORSITE) and Caroline MacLeod (MFR)

February 18 and 23, 2010 Sessions

Introduction

The communication sessions are based on key RESULTS issues identified through the Operational Issues Forum (OIF). The joint MFR and Industry team was tasked with identifying quick wins solutions as it relates to forest operations. The top 10 list had several topics related to the RESULTS application and associated business requirements. In response to industry's requests, Forest Practices Branch has agreed to deliver communication sessions and follow up with a written communiqué in order address some of the key issues.

Data cleanup

Since the migration of our corporate data from ISIS (RESULTS predecessor) to RESULTS, MFR has gone through several iterations of data capture and quality assurance projects. Those projects were necessary in order to fill in the gaps where mandatory key compliance reporting information was missing as well as enabling future reporting under the e-business model.

1. 2005-2008 FS708 form ABC upload project - \$1,000,000
2. 2005-2007 FTA cleanup and incidental RESULTS cleanup - 3,000,000
3. 2008-2009 Strategic cleanup, post 1987 blocks with missing information critical to addressing obligations was queried. Missing information included no standards units, harvest date missing, no forest cover, egregious errors. Most of the easy fixes were done, the rest is seen as a case of diminishing returns, and suggest they can be best addressed as they are encountered with licensee and district cooperation (with the help of APPHELP where need be) - \$1,000,000.
4. 2008-2010 Woodlot cleanup – nearly completed - \$500,000.
5. Ongoing corrections done through APPHELP and District RESULTS contacts and Geomatic staff

Despite our efforts, data consistency, accuracy and currency remains an issue with our historical data. We, the FPB, need to ensure there is clear guidance and direction to District staff. Certain data elements are simply “nice to have” and there is no legal requirement for licensees to update RESULTS historical data e.g. new forest cover updates based on GPS'd traversed data that does not match the NAR on historical blocks where the area was manually entered in ISIS.

Moving forward under FRPA and the e-business model, we have eliminated third party data entry, hence the information we are receiving is as current and accurate as what the clients are supplying to our corporate database. We have better data now than ever under the e-business model due to licensees

submissions. Some licensees have made it a commitment to update RESULTS with accurate information as errors are found.

One of the OIF recommendations was to capture FIA funding to further fund additional data cleanup. Based on our past data cleanup initiatives, the gains at this point would be small for the cost involved and does not make good business sense. Instead we recommend a joint approach where missing data that is impeding reporting be given high priority at the district and regional level and work together with APPHELP and HQ to resolve the issue.

APPHELP¹ is presently processing about 20-25 data fixes a day due to backlog alerts. We have now been allocated resources from IMB to help expedite the process. Also, datafix requests received as early as Monday February 15th were already being processed on Thursday the 18th. When the requests are critical they are given a high priority and processed in a timely fashion.

The key message from the Forest Practices Branch is that we are moving forward and will not rely on FIA funds to lead large data cleanup initiatives.

A “RESULTS Outstanding Data Integrity Items” guidance document is being drafted and will provide direction to licensees and district/regional staff on data integrity moving forward will be handled. The steps would allow Licensees to correct information themselves if they can or are willing if not, contact the district, provide the info and either the district will do the updates or will pass it on to APPHELP. One of the main goal is to build capacity with district and regional staff to assist with information management. Much the ABMs in banks, support to clients did not cease, we still have bank tellers to assist clients. The ministry e-business model failed to provide the support and relies heavily on HQ. With 4000 users and 375 submissions per hour, it’s impossible for APPHELP and HQ alone to provide consistent business and application support.

Further, with the current significant budget cuts (90%), it has impacted MFR’s ability to address all issues as they emerge. We acknowledge that there are outstanding issues with data that has an impact on legally required submissions. Unfortunately there are no queries available to identify those issues and they can only be reported by users. Therefore, the approach to take is to deal with them as they emerge and priority is given to data issues that limit timely and legislated reporting requirements.

Are there any plans for developing better REPORTS for licensees? It is acknowledged that IDIR account holders have access to a greater number of REPORTS but all users have access to all RESULTS data on the LRDW through the business views. We are in the process of reviewing CRS reports accessibility rules and allowing greater access to reports.

¹ NOTE: The present approach that is recommended is for Licensees to contact the district first and then APPHELP if the issue is not resolved. In some districts if the expertise is not there, going directly to APPHELP may be the most cost effective approach. I hear you Bryce but the idea of the districts engaging with APPHELP is that they may learn something and next time around might be able to do it themselves.

RESULTS Information Submission Specifications (RISS) for Licensee Submissions

User feedback on the RESULTS Information Submission Specification document is welcome any time. However, revisions are done annually. The reason is that suggested changes must be vetted through various business areas as they are likely to be impacted as well as other application systems that are sharing business and data elements with the RESULTS application. Also, the changes must be vetted through the Chief Forester who has a final say in the matter, hence, a request for a change may not be granted.

The comments are all considered and issues within our control are addressed but all changes take time to go through the process and have the document updated. One filter we also apply when reviewing proposed updates is the cost associated with the changes. The general rule is if there are any impacts to users, licensees systems and other internal applications e.g. ESF it is unlikely that the change will be approved.

Feedback for modifications to the guide can be emailed directly to Caroline.MacLeod@gov.bc.ca

Limits to MFR Information Requests

One other issue identified was the “unnecessary bureaucracy around RESULTS and that it is not FRPA friendly”. It has been brought up to our attention that MFR staff are regularly requiring licensees to submit more than what they are legally required for example:

- Historical NAR area does not match the forest cover area from digital data submission and the districts are requesting a NAR update via a major amendment;
- MFR requesting forest cover updates following planting activities – the current milestones for forest cover are: denudation, regen delay and free growing;
- Regen delay was declared prior to mandatory e-reporting and forest cover exists on file but the districts are requesting that licensees submit the information to RESULTS. There are no obligations for the licensees to provide the MFR with update digital information for pre ESF era. Also, many of these blocks will undergo updates as they achieve FG and will provide MFR with digital up-to-date information.

We certainly do not want to discourage ministry staff from expecting good data but we also need to ensure that we do not request information that is outside the legal mandate. That being said any historical data that is erroneous under MFR’s responsibility. **The licensees are not responsible for making updates to correct historical data.**

Under FRPA, the licensees “own” the data. In many cases, there are no validation rules to ensure the right data elements enter the system some rely on professionals to supply the MFR with the most up-to-date and accurate information. Therefore, if errors are noted by the MFR staff they need to pass those on to the licensee.

For all Data: There are varying eras for responsibility, these need to be clearly identified and the responsibilities spelled out.

- Pre 2002 all data integrity issues are the MFR responsibility.
- 2002- June 1st 2005 – Joint responsibility - (June 1st 2005 coincide with mandatory e-reporting, however as early as 2003, many licensees were already submitting to the Ministry electronically, if the user timestamp is associated with a BCeID, it is licensees data, if user timestamp associated with an IDIR account the data was entered in RESULTS by a data service provider (lots of interpretation hence some errors are showing up) then it is MFR's responsibility. It is important to point out that RESULTS tracks all transactions down to the user date and time.
- Post June 1st 2005 - Data integrity is licensee's responsibility. (Please note that woodlot's e-submission deadline was April 30 2007)

Corrections to Openings Managed with Site Plans

Corrections to Site Plan Openings are done via "Site Plan Amendment". This is the mean by which RESULTS information may be updated to match the "on file" document. It is important to note that most site plan documents are no longer stored in district opening files.

Data elements that may be updated via site plan amendments include the followings: NAR, maximum soil disturbance and BEC. Stocking standard may be amended by amending the SSID and not specific elements of the stocking standards as they are tied to approve regime id. If the regime information is inaccurate or not consistent with the approved document (FDP or FSP) it should be reported to district staff who will get APPHELP t do a datafix to update the regime with the correct information. Please note that the updates done to the regime id will not ripple through at the SU level. Thus, if a regime is modified, the changes would need to be made to the standard units by re-assigning the SSID to the SU via a site plan amendment.

Stocking Standard Flexibility

It was brought up to our attention that RESULTS may not offer flexibility for the management of stocking standard under FRPA and does not lend to innovation. Stocking standards may be as flexible as a user may want them to be if they have the right process developed and approved in their FSP (or in additional standards for FDP stocking standards). The standards may be generic for the management of the most common sites and they may be varied based on unique conditions and circumstances on a site by site basis at the SU level. This variation of a stocking standard is called an approved variation and is an existing functionality in the RESULTS application. An example of an approved variation would be: Fdc is considered an acceptable species in the CWH vm1 06 sites series however, it is considered preferred for the variant on south facing slopes. If a site meets the condition for ecological classification and is also south facing, a user may initiate an approved variation to update Fdc from acceptable to preferred.