

## **AZ Budget Database Training**

### **Running Budget Cruncher Reports – Module 4**

My name is Mark Harner. I am currently a budget analyst at the Arizona State Office. As part of my duties, I deal with all aspects of the budget planning and execution process. Also, I assist database users on a daily basis fielding questions and providing assistance. Additionally I provide budget-related training on a quarterly basis via Online Webex Sessions. My name is Patrick Putnam and I am the Associate District Manager for the Phoenix District Office. A big part of my job is the planning and implementation of the District Budget. I also work with other Arizona ADM's and am involved with the AZ Strategic Budget Team. I was brought into the AZ Budget Planning Tool expansion project to help provide a "Field" prospective on how the Districts might use this tool.....Well, and maybe also because I think Budget Planning can be FUN!! Now that I've introduced myself and gone over why this training is important, let's take a look at the objectives of this lesson. By the end of this lesson and with the use of a computer, employees will be able to demonstrate the ability to generate a variety of Budget Cruncher reports in the Arizona Budget Database. They will also be able to explain where the obligation data comes from, describe how it is loaded into the database and the various methods to compare these obligations to the planning data already discussed in previous videos. Employees will also be able to locate these reports, determine the best parameters to use and pull up the reports. They will also be able to demonstrate the ability to determine the best way to analyze the reports and export to Excel, if they desire. This lesson is important because you will gain the ability and the tools necessary to utilize these very powerful reports. You will gain access to the vast amount of data available to you by comparing the planning data to actual obligation data. Let's take a look at how we will go about achieving these objectives. OK, so let's briefly go over what this lesson covers. First, we will begin by discussing the various data elements that are uploaded from the Financial and Business Management System (FBMS). We will also find out how the elements relate to their counterparts in the planning side of the database. Next we will locate the Budget Cruncher reports and demonstrate the procedures involved in selecting report criteria or parameters in order to ensure that productive reports are generated. Finally, we will demonstrate the procedures for exporting reports to MS-Excel for further review. Once again, we want to emphasize that when we get to the demo portion of this session, we are going to use the Testing Site for our demonstrations. Some of the looks are not exactly the same as what you might currently be seeing in the production side of the database. The upgrades that we will be discussing, have not been loaded into Production yet. However, they have already been installed on the test site for testing purposes. Please do not get hung up on the fact that reports we pull may show data that you are sure is

not correct ... because it is definitely not correct. We are just looking at the functionality which is the same as the live site will have when this training comes out. Now that we know the Objectives and overall course map, Mark, let's dive into the first main discussion of this training – the basic foundation for FBMS Data Elements. Thanks, Patrick! FBMS is short for the Financial and Business Management System used by all Bureaus within the Department of Interior. It is the Official Accounting System for the Department and the repository for all Allocations, Obligations and Payments for the current fiscal year and beyond. Some folks (myself included) like to look at the FBMS system as similar to a Bank while our local records compare to an individual's checkbook. This may sound a bit weird, but stick with me for a minute. For example, simply entering a deposit into your checkbook does not make the funds available in the bank. Until that deposit shows up in the bank, you probably shouldn't be writing checks against it. Similarly, writing a \$500 check for a new TV is basically a promise that there is \$500 in your account. Entering \$400 in your checkbook for that cost does nothing to help you when the check is cashed and you only have \$400 in your account. OK, maybe you are still saying "Dude is crazy", but the bottom line is that FBMS (like the Bank) is the official accounting system which needs to be reconciled with our local plan or (checkbook). Hey Mark, why do we use FBMS Data? The easy answer - FBMS data can and must be compared to and reconciled with our planning costs in the database ... in order to ensure that individual Field Offices, Districts and the State stay within its allocation while also completing the Workload Measures for which the funds were provided. Funds were initially planned with both eyes towards completing the required Work. While there will always be reprogramming of funds, this must be always be done with the required work (which also may change) at the forefront of the reprogramming process. To illustrate this reconciliation process, let's take one more excursion into the Bank analogy. If you would consider your own budget at home for a moment, we will look at a couple of examples. Say you plan \$1,000 per month for your mortgage, you make the payment and enter the charge into your checkbook. Next day, you make your planned car payment of \$400 and enter that charge into your checkbook. At the end of the month, you get your bank statement and reconcile it with your budget plan and checkbook. Listed first on the statement is your mortgage payment for \$1,000 ... Boom! It matches you plan and your checkbook entry ... Check, Reconciled. Next is your car payment for \$400 ... Boom! It matches your plan and your checkbook entry ... Check, Reconciled. Now, let's look at the FBMS example. We had \$500 planned in the database for a GSA purchase. Once it hits FBMS, it will be uploaded to the AZ database and reconciled with the planned amount. Check! Example 2 ... We planned for a \$12,000 contract with \$1,000 payments each month. The full amount of \$12,000 is obligated so that full amount is uploaded to the AZ database and that amount is reconciled with the planned amount. We will discuss this difference between Obligation and Expenditures or Payments in upcoming slides. The key point here is that for

contracts and some other instruments, they are fully obligated up front and that is the amount brought into the AZ Database. Payments on these contracts are not brought into the database. Now let's look further into FBMS Data Types. Without going too deep into the weeds, funding is provided by Congress and distributed through the Department of the Interior and the Washington Office to the Arizona State Office. From there, it is further distributed the Districts and Field Offices. This process could be and has been covered in a full training session of it's own. By law, these funds cannot be exceeded. Obligations are defined as the amounts of orders placed, contracts awarded or a variety of other impending costs where a payment for these goods or services will be required in the future. Whether an actual Contract entered by our procurement staff or a Miscellaneous Obligation by the budget staff, all of these Obligations must be supported by written documentation. Expenditures, on the other hand, are actual payments made either as a result of a prior obligation (such as a contract payment), or without prior obligation (such as a credit card purchase or employee labor costs). When pulling FBMS reports, the options available include both Obligations and Expenditures. In addition, the Obligations can be further broken down to whether they have been liquidated (basically paid) or not. So, when pulling an FBMS Funds Status report, you would see the Allocation (or Funds provided), Unliquidated (or undelivered) Obligations and Liquidated Obligations (or Expenditures). The term Total Obligations involves all Obligations whether paid or not and for the sake of the AZ Budget Tool, we will be looking at the total amount for all reconciliations. In the example on the screen, the full \$12,000 is considered as obligated at the end of the calendar year, while \$3,000 has actually been expended. The database will also show that \$12,000 is obligated (matching our budget plan) and the undelivered portion of the contract is managed separately. Please keep this in mind as a general rule. Next, we will look at the actual FBMS Data elements that are uploaded to the AZ database. As previously discussed, there are currently four reports downloaded from FBMS for use in the AZ Budget Tool. The specific data elements contained in each report are displayed on the screen and we will discuss these in detail on upcoming slides. We will also show how these data elements compare to similar fields contained in the database. As you can see, these reports will reflect summaries or totals of Allocations, Labor Spent and Operations Obligated. If AZ950, L1010 was allocated \$10,000 at PTA (say January 15<sup>th</sup>) and then an additional \$5,000 in March - Only the total of \$15,000 would be reflected in this report. Same goes for Labor as it is a cumulative amount of all pay periods to date ... and all Ops charges are totaled within these fields as well. Now, you can see that the FBMS Allocation data is directly related to the Allocation data contained in the database. It makes sense that when all of the Work is planned (funded or unfunded), the funding levels must be the same in FBMS and the budget tool. Also, in a perfect world, you would expect that the amounts planned and funded in those tasks would also reflect that same amount ... although it is generally not to the exact dollar or penny. A

huge benefit of utilizing the budget tool in this manner is that if during the fiscal year extra funds are received, the FBMS Allocation would be increased, the database Allocation would be increased and the database plan or (individual tasks) can easily be amended to either complete that unfunded work or increase the workload with that additional funding. Conversely, if funds are decreased during the fiscal year, the allocations would be decreased and some work may need to be moved to the unfunded side of a task or multiple tasks. The next slide shows how the FBMS Labor data directly compares to the same fields in the budget tool. Employee Hour and Amount totals by Funds Center and Subactivity are directly related and compared to the totals planned in the database. They are both keyed on the unique employee Vendor Number which we will discuss in more detail in upcoming slides.

The Pay Code is also a field uploaded from FBMS; however, it is used to determine any "Premium Labor" costs incurred. Such costs are planned in the budget tool as Operations costs and must be reconciled in that same fashion. In other words, a user might plan \$1,000 for the fiscal year in L1660 premium labor and as overtime (110) charges accumulate in L1660, they would be reconciled against that \$1000. The Operations data uploaded from FBMS is similarly compared to corresponding fields in the budget tool with the difference being the Key used for reconciliation. We use the Budget Object Class (or the specific classification of the material purchased) to compare the two data sets. However, since the BOC is still an optional field (and is likely to remain that way), an additional table is used in the database which relates each BOC to a specific Minor Category in the Database. In other words, the database compares each BOC uploaded, to locate the related Minor Category and combines them with the appropriate selection. For example, all Travel BOCs (211A, 211B, etc.) are combined and the FBMS Obligations are compared with the Planned Costs citing the "Travel" Minor Category. If you remember back to the Task Sheets (under the Ops tab), this exact same process works in reverse as the user might select "Travel" Minor Category and those BOCs would be the only options available. We have briefly touched on the Employee Number as it is used as a Key for Budget Planning and Cruncher reports. Basically, this Vendor number and the FPPS Org are determined when HR sets up an employee's account in the Federal Personnel Payroll System (FPPS). The FPPS Org is simply the employee's home office. Again, this uploaded table will use the Vendor numbers along with the most recent Pay Period to determine each employee's current FPPS Org. This field becomes important in a number of Budget Cruncher reports to assist user's to verify who is charging to their accounts (especially if they were not planned). Now you might be saying, "How does this data get into the Tool"? Well, we are going to show you right now. As discussed, those four FBMS reports are downloaded into a single Microsoft-Excel file, which is then reconfigured into the correct format for upload to the AZ Budget Tool. Both of these procedures are completed totally behind-the-scenes by the State Office budget shop. The entire process generally takes

less a half hour and the plan is to complete this task as close to each workday as possible and generally by 7am. Please note that all users must be logged out of the database while the upload takes place. This is why the plan is to complete the process prior to 7am. An awesome feature of this process is that the data and all reports will be available to all users as soon as that upload is completed. OK, so now that we have covered all of the background information regarding the FBMS data and the process involved in uploading the data to our Budget Tool, let's take a look at some of the reports available to all users! We have previously covered where to find the database and the procedures for login. If you have any trouble with this, please feel free to go back to those training sessions and review. That said, we will be starting the demonstration from the home page. Again, we are using the Test Site for the reasons previously discussed. We will also be looking at FY14 data since we already have test data loaded for both the planning and FBMS sides. Once again, we will enter this process by clicking on the Run Reports tab and you will see the same form that was shown during the Budget Planning Reports session. For the fiscal year range, we will select 2014 for both fields. Most Budget Cruncher reports can also compare multiple fiscal years, we will keep this simple for now though. The procedures would be exactly the same as discussed in the previous training session. The Report Type we will select is of course Module and Main Category of Budget Cruncher. Please note the new text field to the right of this selection. Now, the most recent FBMS upload date is shown on the screen. This is provided for users to know, at a glance, how current the data is for comparison purposes. As discussed, the data will generally not be more than a couple of days old. But it is also important to know that if you entered some labor corrections into FBMS on the 1<sup>st</sup>, they will not be reflected in the budget tool until the date listed here is at least the 2<sup>nd</sup>. An informational note - since Fiscal Year 14 FBMS data will not change after the fiscal year closeout, there will not be a need for further updates so this date currently shown (once loaded in production) will not change. Plans are to upload FY13 and FY14 FBMS data into the production database once it goes LIVE. Next, when we look at the Sub Category, you might notice that there are a few less categories available than in the Budget Planning mode. No worries, there are plenty of reporting options available to even the most studious user. We will start by selecting the Allocations Options. Under Allocations sub-category, you will see two report options: Allocation Aggregated or Detailed. First, let's look at the aggregated (or summarized) report. When a specific report is selected, the criteria or parameter options will again be presented to the user. For this example, we will select all Colorado River District offices, Subactivities L1010 and L1020, All PEs & Minor Categories and click the Preview button. Again, we will need to reiterate the disclaimer provided earlier regarding test data. In addition, there was no requirement in FY14 for Districts or Divisions to go back into the Planning database to plan additional allocations (or reductions) at that time. Starting in FY15 and even more so in FY16, this data should start to look much cleaner

as this approach continues to evolve. You can immediately see that this is a birds-eye view of these two subactivities with CRD. The first column provides the total Allocation; the next three columns reflect planned amounts with the fifth column showing the remaining allocation that was unplanned. The next 3 columns reflect the Spent (or obligated) amounts, while the final column shows the amount of allocation that was not actually spent. If we look at this data as if it was current and live data, we would note that L1020 was very well planned (only 45 cents of the allocation was unplanned) - while L1010 was not so well planned (over \$25K left after the planning process was complete). Also, nobody would be happy with the \$18K and \$101K leftover as unspent at FY end in those subactivities. However, the ability to pull these reports throughout the year will greatly simplify the tracking of these issues. Next, let's look at the detailed report. We will use the same parameters as we did for the aggregated report, just so we can easily contrast the layout of the two reports. The main difference is obvious. Instead of District Totals in the aggregated report, this detailed report shows the same data totaled by Office and rolled up to Subactivity subtotals and the District Grand Total. This report could be used to focus in on any of the issues that we noted with the aggregated report by recognizing that perhaps it was a problem with a single office or throughout the District. Other potential uses of this report are again similar to the aggregated report, but as the name indicates, the data is fine-tuned to the office level. Now might be a good time to discuss an important aspect of all these Budget Cruncher reports. How to correct discrepancies found when running these reports. Basically, the key will be to know whether it is a charge in FBMS that caused the problem, or planning within the database. The answer to that question will tell you where you need to go to fix the problem. For example: Under LLAZC02 or (Yuma) and Subactivity L1020, the Unspent Allocation shows a negative \$259.45. Ordinarily, this would mean that they are overspent there and they would likely want to either make a Labor Adjustment or maybe a Credit Card adjustment in FBMS to get that Subactivity out of the negative. On the same line, there is a \$3,000 Unplanned Allocation. Basically this means that they were given an allocation of \$119K, but only planned \$116K. The obvious solution to this issue would be to go into the Task Sheets and determine where you might be able to plan an additional \$3,000. However, just as possible might be the fact that the office just does not require those funds to accomplish the tasks. In that case, the office might offer to give the funds back to the District (which actually works perfectly since the District is overplanned \$3,000 in L1020. The additional possibility in this case could be that there was a \$3,000 task planned in C00 when it should have been in C02. Now, let's take a look at some Employees reports. Here you see three reports under this subcategory. The first one we will look at is Labor Planned vs Spent by Employee. This is an extremely versatile report, as the user can look at the entire State or and individual employee. Further, the selection parameters can be fine-tuned by the user to get basically any combination in between. For the first demonstration, we will select AZ914

with ALL FA Budget Activities and PEs, and since we have already narrowed the pool of employees with AZ914, we will select ALL employees as well. The report shows all employee hours which meet the selected criteria. As we scroll down to Mark's record you will see the basic layout of most Budget Cruncher reports basically planned vs spent. In the case of any Labor related reports, they will show Hours planned vs spent in addition to dollars. You can see that these amounts are pretty well in sync. Like many administrative employees, Mark's hours are spread over a number of Subactivities. Others might only plan and use a single subactivity throughout the year. In the case of admin employees such as Mark, there is no problem with spending according to the plan. For most employees, hours must be coded to where the work was performed each pay period. These employees should still be looking at work & coding to these budget tasks, but the labor plans are often more fluid if the workload changes for a variety of reasons. In such occasions, hours planned may need updated more than the labor spent is adjusted. Bottom line - is that "Truth in coding" requires that labor must be coded where the work is performed. If we scroll down further, you can see something that the Budget Office sees far too often. Hours planned for a vacant position but not reduced as the position stays vacant. If it were already July when this position became vacant, there would be no reason to plan 856 hours or about 5 work months when there are only 2 months left in the fiscal year. As you can imagine, there are literally dozens of uses for this report. Please feel free to make use of it as much as possible. The next couple of reports we will look at are more like validation reports rather than the data-filled blockbusters we have covered. The first such report is the Employees by Current FPPS Org Codes. Here you will note that the only selection criteria is the Funds Center we will select all of the 930 Offices. As you can see, this report is a very simple way to validate employees in each office. The vendor numbers are provided along with the pay period of the most recent FBMS data received for each employee. While handy for this purpose, there really is not a lot of additional information which can be gleaned from this report. The other report is the Employees by Outside FPPS Org Codes. Here you will note that in addition to the Funds Center, the user also has the option of narrowing the search by Subactivity. We will again select all of the 930 Offices and all Subactivities. Here, the user can identify employees with an FPPS Org outside the selected Funds Center who are charging labor to that Office. For example, we have 3 FA117 employees charging AZ930. While they may have had authorization since they are Fire employees, it probably should have been AZ934 being charged. As we move down the list, we may be able to identify some folks who were in the Resources Division on a detail, others that may have transferred mid-year to or from 930 and probably the majority who had the authorization to charge to these codes. This determination will decide the steps to be taken, if any. In the case of the three employees charging to AZ930 / LF561, if they should have charged to AZ934 a labor adjustment might be in order. Unfamiliar names might need to be researched to

determine why they charged to our accounts. Most records reflected on this report will probably just be noted as OK. Now, let's move on to some additional Labor Reports. Here you see six reports under this subcategory, some of which we have already seen under other subcategories. We will skip those reports, but you can feel free to pause the video if you like to go back and review any of them. The first report that we will look at is Cost Center Labor Charges by Outside FPPS Org. This report is based on the same premise as the last, but the format is completely different. We will use the same parameters (even though we could focus in on specific Subactivities, PEs and/or Employees. As you can see, the report is sorted by employee name and shows the vendor# and FPPS Org. Then it provides the Funds Center and Subactivity charged along with the hours and dollars spent. This information comes in handy both in determining whether the charge to our Funds Center is correct, as well as determining how bad is the damage. The second on the list is an AZ951 employee charging to AZ931. Could it be possible that Eddie simply miscoded this labor? Or, did he do work for them that they agreed to pay? Hmmm, Interesting! As we scroll down, we come to Jeff Brown who is located in AZ934, but occasionally charges to other offices within the AZ930 Division. Since the query compares code to code, similar examples of this show up quite often in the Districts as well. Again, there will probably be many valid charges listed on this report, but it is a valuable tool to occasionally uncover possible discrepancies. With the next report, we can start by looking at Labor Planned vs Spent by FA Budget Activity. In this example we will key in on the field and L1060 subactivity (which is Wild Horse & Burro). The format is again similar as it is showing us Hours & Labor Planned, Spent and Remaining. But this time it is shown by Office, Subactivity and employee. At a glance you can see that the Arizona Strip District has not planned or spent any L1060 funds on Labor which is good because they generally do not receive funds in that subactivity. Most of the L1060 funds are used for Assistance Agreements at the State Office and for labor in the Colorado River and Phoenix Districts - as you can see on this report. Once again, we could go through this report to see if labor is being charged to the planned Subactivity and if it is not, we would want to research why and maybe make adjustments either to the hours planned or charged. Next, a very similar report is the Labor Planned vs Spent by FA Budget Activity and Office Group. Here, if we select the exact same criteria, the entire Office Group (District in this case, or Division for State Office) will be displayed and totaled together. While the Budget Analyst might want to see how this particular data is broken down by office as in the previous report, a manager (such as the District Manager), might want to see a more summarized view of the data. Now might be a good time to take another look at exporting a report to Microsoft-Excel. Once again, simply click on the "Export to Excel" link and then "Open" once that option appears. As with all report exports, you see three tabs. The first that appears is basically the same formatted report, except in Excel. It can be adjusted for column width and other cosmetic enhancement, but basically this

report is simply for printing. The second tab provides the most useful Excel sheet in a raw data format. With this data, you can sort by vendor, total by hours planned, then delete total, or create a simple pivot table from the data. Pretty Cool! Isn't it? The same Excel options for creating Pie Charts, Line Charts or any other visual representation of the data. Finally, the User Query tab shows the user specifically what criteria was used to create this report – just as it shows on the on-screen report. As a reminder, these Excel files can be exported for most Budget Cruncher reports and do provide a bit more flexibility for showing the data in different ways. Next, let's try to get inside the head of a State Office Program Lead, and look at the PE Labor by Selected Cost Centers. Once again, we are going to look at the Wild Horse & Burro program (L1060) and will pull all Labor in the State this time. You can see that this report could be extremely helpful for a program lead to see where our labor funds are being spent on given Subactivity and PE combinations. It would also be very useful to see this information from a District or Field Office level as well. As we scroll down this list, the user might look at DP (Land Use Plan) no hours were planned, but 95.5 were used. Maybe this should have been a different PE or not. Scroll further down, we get to Law Enforcement – NU. Yes, that makes sense and these seem to be LE employees. Next, PC – hmmm - Cultural/Historical program support - maybe? Finally, some admin support from HR, Budget and IT ... all part of the administrative overhead factored in. You can see there is lots of data to look at and different issues to consider. Finally, we will take a look at the FA Budget Activity by Selected Cost Centers report and we are going to look one more time at the Wild Horse & Burro program (L1060) and the entire State. This report is a simple listing of all employees who are planned or have used hours in L1060 but hopefully it is made up of folks who were planned and spent in L1060. A nice feature of this report is the fact that you basically get all of the information available for each line of data. If we focus in on the LLAZ952000 entry that we looked at on a previous report, we see that this individual had a total of 267 hours planned in L1060.HG and perhaps those 95.50 hours spent in DP may have belonged in HG to bring it up to those planned hours. Again, there are many examples we could use, but hopefully this has generated a desire to take a closer look at some of these labor reports in order to fine-tune our planning and spending habits. Once again, please feel free to browse for yourself any reports that we did not cover. Next, we will shift gears a bit and move into the Operations reports. These reports will be very similar to the Labor Reports with the obvious exception being that they deal with Operations planned vs spent as opposed to Labor. This also results in Minor Categories and Budget Object Class (BOC) now being important rather than hours. The first report we will view is Ops Planned vs Spent by FA Budget Activity. You will note that those Minor Categories are available to use as part of your selection parameters. In this example let's go to the Gila District and L1990 Subactivity with all PEs and Minor Categories. As you can see, the report is displayed in a nice format by the Subactivity selected within each Gila Office. We have previously

discussed the fact that BOCs have not been used much in the planning database and as such, some information may look skewed. However, if we look at the bottom line totals for the District Office (AZG00), we see that there was about \$44K in Ops Planned, but nearly \$93K spent. This difference translates into each category. Looking at the 4 line items under Supplies, we see that all of the Planned dollars (\$4,432) are located under the "None" BOC, while the actual charges have come into 261A, 262F and 264B. These figures could be compared for planned vs spent rather than going down to the BOC. Another good example of what you will see on this report is the Vehicle line items. Again, the GSA leased vehicle charges come in under BOC of 222E, so all charges planned under the GSA Vehicle tab of the Task Sheet are automatically set for Ops Planned under Vehicles and 222E. Similarly, DOI-owned vehicle charges come in under BOCs 253F and 253U and all costs planned on the DOI tab automatically go to Ops Planned under Vehicles and those BOCs. If these are out of sync, maybe the charges were not properly planned in the database or there were extenuating circumstances, but either way, the user can definitely utilize all of the data on this report either to improve planning or reprogram spending. Next, we will look at a very similar report which is just organized a little differently. Ops Planned vs Spent by FA Budget Activity and Minor Category Using the Gila District again, this time with L1210 and L1220 Subactivities, we see that the data is laid out in a very similar fashion. However all of the selected Funds Centers are grouped together basically in aggregated totals. All of the same observations we made in the previous report are still valid, but it might be a little easier to come to those conclusions with the data in this format. We could pull this same report for the entire State just to see how it looks, or once we have the entire State selected we could limit the Minor Category to just Awards to see that specific State-wide data. There are SO many options! The next two reports on the list are exactly the same reports that we just looked at - EXCEPT for the way they are displayed on the screen. If we choose the Ops Planned vs Spent by Minor Category and FA Budget Activity report and set the selection criteria as Gila Offices, Subactivities L1210 & L1220 with all PEs and Minor Categories, we see a very similar report. As with the previous report, all of the Funds Centers are grouped together, but now the data is sorted by BOC and Subactivity within the Minor Category. Here we could easily look at the vehicles (or other category) all lumped together and make conclusions a bit easier. Selecting the Ops Planned vs Spent by Minor Category with the same selection criteria shows the same data and layout, but combines all of the selected Subactivities into single line items.

If you want to see Ops spending by PE, then PE Ops by Selected Cost Centers is the report for you! If we create a report for AZ9801 (that's Statewide Costs) with L1010 thru L1060, and all Minor Categories we can see the format which sorts first on PE, then by Minor Category and then lists the specific data. Finally, the FA Budget Activity Ops by Selected Cost Centers shows the same information and only differs on how it is sorted

and displayed. Using the same criteria - AZ9801 with L1010 thru L1060, and all Minor Categories we can see the format change which sorts first on Subactivity vice PE, then the same by Minor Category and listing of specific data. Our final demos of this video involve reports which combine the Labor and Ops data on single reports for our viewing pleasure. These reports will have similar aspects drawn from both the Labor Reports and some Ops Reports. First we will look at the Labor and Ops Planned vs Spent Aggregated Report. This may be one of the most important manager-level reports available in the database as it provides a simple snapshot as to how each subactivity looks within the Office, District or entire State selected. Let's start with the Hassayampa Field Office (AZP01) with all Subactivities, PEs and Minor Categories. At a glance, the user can see the Labor, Ops and combined breakdown for each Subactivity. It provides the birds-eye view to easily identify issues where one or more of the Labor or Operations reports would provide the detail that you might need to rectify those issues. Perhaps a manager at the District Level might want to look at this data for the entire District. Use the same report, but simply select all of the Fund Centers in that District. Now all five of the offices are rolled up into a similar report, but aggregated by District. So, if we focus in on L1050 we see that the Labor was overspent by about \$33K which is somewhat offset by Remaining Ops of almost \$5K for an over deficit of about \$28K. In order to drill down and see what might have caused this issue, we would probably want to go to a labor report and identify the specific labor charges that might have made. However, for this session, we will just go on to the next report. The report we will need is the Labor & Ops Planned vs Spent Detailed. If we stick with the scenario above - PDO Offices, focus in on L1050 with all PEs and Minor Categories, we can see that there are small issues in the District Office (about \$5K in labor), and Agua Fria (just 2-3 unplanned hours), but the big problem is at Lower Sonoran where labor is over \$30K overspent. Ba Da Bing! We feel compelled to reiterate one more time that this is just test data and should not in any way be construed as anything more than a training exercise. The next report, Labor & Ops Planned vs Spent by FA Budget Activity, is something of a hybrid of the previous two reports. We will select AZ910 thru AZ914, L1010 & L1020 with all PEs and Minor Categories. It shows the same data fields as the previous two reports, but by sorting on the Subactivity first – it provides a nice breakdown of the individual offices selected within each Subactivity. If we were to take the previous scenario one step further – PDO Offices with L1050, we get a very clean report - perhaps preferable to the Detailed report that we pulled up earlier. Totally up to the preference of the user, but each report uses and provides the same data no matter the user preferences. The final report that we will cover today is the Minor Category Ops and Labor – Planned vs Spent by Cost Center report. We will again select AZ910 thru 914, but only L1010 this time around. Generally, this report is best suited for a single Subactivity or else it may be comparing apples to oranges. As the name might lead you to believe, this is basically a hodge podge of Labor and Ops data thrown onto

a single report for analysis. Again, at a glance you get a big picture based on the selection criteria, but you also receive a lot of detail in which to determine and hopefully correct any problems that might arise. The reports displayed in this demo are just for starters. If any user has a need for additional reports, or additional data in reports we already have - they can simply submit an email outlining their need. The request will be reviewed and if appropriate, included in a future update to the system. This will conclude the live demo portion of this session and leads directly into the conclusion. In conclusion, the objective of this lesson was, to provide employees with the necessary information to demonstrate the ability to generate a variety of Budget Cruncher reports in the AZ budget database and successfully compare the new obligation data to Planning data already contained in the database. These new capabilities include the capacity to explain the thought-process involved in selecting parameters to use in these reports. In order to reach that objective, we discussed the various data elements pulled from FBMS and how they relate to the corresponding data already contained in the database.. Also, we demonstrated where to find these reports and discussed how to enter specific selection criteria in order to generate productive reports. At the same time we demonstrated how to export certain reports to MS-Excel in order to further analyze the data. Before we conclude this lesson, we would like to go over a few key takeaways. 1) The recent addition of the Budget Cruncher to the Arizona Budget Database Tool dramatically increases the ability for all levels of BLM Arizona to track spending throughout the fiscal year. 2) This tracking process is made possible by comparing obligation data to planning data behind the scenes, enabling Users to access that data via customizable reports. 3) This available wealth of data can also be exported to Microsoft-Excel for further analysis or other reporting displays. The information presented in this lesson should be useful to you regardless of what role you play in the AZ Budget Process. Understanding and familiarization with the powerful Budget Cruncher functionality will be a very important step in your current position or perhaps in future positions. Budget can play such an important role in any position that you might hold. The next planned upgrade (Incorporating PMDS Accomplishment Data) is currently planned to be completed around the end of March. We are planning a similar series of training videos to be completed in conjunction with the planned mid-April release of the upgraded Database. Thank you for your time and interest! We hope you will also take advantage of future offerings.