CoreBIS Working Group Meeting
29 August 2023

Transcription taken during the group discussion

Note: Some paragraphs have been altered slightly to represent product names, however less attention has been made to spelling or grammar. The order of the text is how the items were said in the meeting.

Karl Blackler: OK, now from the CAB the other day, the transcript and the PowerPoint is up on the website up on our portal. So if you need to look at that, the transcription service was very poor. So I had to go through and actually like rewrite a lot of the transcription.

So first of all welcome to the working group. So this is where we will bring up any specific items that we want to work through just to get your feedback and try and take you through from a technical perspective. Something a little bit under the hood, some of the inner workings and how we are trying to progress the product. At any time, feel free to ask questions

Today we are going to go through the current process, how the workflow works at the moment. Hopefully most of you should know how the workflow works given some of you have used it for quite some time. Now we're going to go over how we will propose to change that. And as part of that, we have a data movement report and then we will have an open discussion at the end for anything else that you want to talk about.

But primarily this is about the workflow. The reason we're bringing up the workflow is obviously we know that no one is using it the way that it was first intended to be used. We will get to that through this PowerPoint.

OK, are all the people on the call?

OK, current process. So you're all familiar with the workflow overview page? We have the data sources and we have the form. I'll go to the next slide tells me at the moment the current processes. We load all our cubes up, we load our base cube, we load our tagged cube, we review all our data. So we look at our new element, report changes and tagging, reconciliation reports, etc. We can even review the form at that stage if we need to and then we lock down the data. We have a review of the data, which locks it down and then we approve the data. Once we've approved all of the data, the forms become available. We then open forms, review them, look at them, do any manual adjustments that we need to, and then go through the review, approve and submit the APRA. Now some of you may only have a two-step where you have a review and the approver effectively submits to APRA. It automatically does the third step, but as far as the system is concerned, we have the three steps.

OK, now, as we go through the process, we're primarily in the working version, all the time. So this is the ARA return version. So as we go through the review, approve and submit to APRA stages, we are looking at the working version. Throughout that whole process, the working version is linked to our source data. So whenever we update tag data, it's automatically updating and we can obviously click on a field or an attribute and drill down back into the tagged data. At that point. When we lock the data, it is locking the data on the working version, and it is not until we get to the submit to APRA stage that the submitted version and the final version come into play. If we're doing a submission for a particular form we would have a submitted version which would be basically an identical copy of the working version, and we'd have a final version which is a values-only copy of that. And then, as we do a resubmission, we would have a working version for resubmission, a submitted version for resubmission and the final version would be the period. So that you would be able to see the one final with the multiple submitted versions.

At the moment, the submitted version really doesn't play much of a role in the system at all. It's right at the end of the process and is of little use, to be honest. It will always match the working version. There's no difference in parameters or anything like that. So it's kind of, surplus to requirements.

By period, we have all of our tagging versions, and also our mapping versions. So that's the level at which that versioning is taking place. So it's not at a lower level than that, it is at the period and that tagged version. So whether it's a submission or resubmission or whichever,
OK, so the current process, tagging and mapping is versioned for every submission version which we know. So resubmission is separate from the submission. We obviously can provide the drill-through because all the data is linked live to the forms at all times except for the final version, which is a values copy of our live-linked version. So we can't change the live-linked during that process because the data is locked. That will always be In Sync. It allows for analysis of source data when queries are raised at any point in time. Because we know that the numbers we're seeing are always linked to the lowest level, it's always going to match.
Now the negative to that is the data must be locked. The review and approved forms now, monthly and quarterly forms, and to get all of the data submitted before our first form is due is generally quite difficult and generally is not done by most of you. We cannot update tagging and mapping after the data is locked. So if you find anything has gone wrong after you've locked all the data, tough bickies basically it's all locked down. You can't go back at that point and make changes to base data tagging or mapping. Updates will require a resubmission version at this point. So you're stuck, I guess, at this point.

We load the data, we update the tagging and mapping. We don't submit anything and we submit it to APRA. So we're submitting our working version effectively of our monthlies to APRA and then we continue working on the data to get our quarterlies right. Then we submit our quarterlies to APRA and then once we're all happy with everything we submit and sign off everything within the system. Now this means that all of our reviewing and agreeing and making sure that you know we go through the four eyes, six eyes, however many eyes you want, they're all done off system. They're not done in Corbis. They're done generally in emails and the back of an envelope or wherever they are, or in the notes field as Kerry does it for Beyond Bank. Which from our perspective is unacceptable. So we want the system to be able to work as intended, AKA tracking the progress of the submissions and allow you to do that in real-time. So AKA submitting your forms so that it actually progresses the workflow.

So the risks at the moment are that changes to data during the reporting period will
mean you are not signing off your monthly forms even though you've sent them to APRA. And then as you're doing your quarterly forms you're hoping that when you reload your tag cubes and so forth to get your, quarterlies working, that the monthlies don't change. So there's a risk that the APRA submitted versions for monthlies won't match what the monthly form says within CoreBIS.

Is that how everyone sees it on the call? Does anyone want to comment on that?

Kerri McCarron: And there is that risk. But there's also a benefit in that if you do happen to find a mistake in your submitted monthly returns as you're going through and doing other returns, you can do the change within the same workflow and resubmit through D2A without having to do a resubmit workflow.
It might be a bit naughty, but it's very convenient.

Dawn Campbell: For us at Bank Australia, we keep our month, if it's a quarter end, we keep that workflow open as far as we can almost into the next month. So we never have one open at the same time and we'll always close one workflow and immediately open the other one.

Kerri McCarron: We pretty much do the same at Beyond as well. So we don't close it until basically everything's been submitted through D2A or APRA Connect.

Dawn Campbell: Yeah, that's right Kerri, and we don't do anything for them by form. We simply open the workflow and we won't close it until we actually approve all the data and all the forms at one point.

Kerri McCarron: Yeah. We do the same.

Karl Blackler: Yeah. So at the moment, it's not until and I guess that previous slide shows, you know, the very last thing you do is you sign off your workflow data and forms. So you've already submitted everything already done, and then you go through and submit everything. So when the auditor comes along and goes. When did you submit this monthly form, CoreBIS says three weeks after it was due it has been submitted. And instead of, you know, the day that you actually agreed it was alright.
Then the Auditor gives us a bad name because we're not locking things down.

Michael McIntyre: Hi Karl, Michael McIntyre from Nutrien.
We've also got a challenge we have an annual return the ARF_750 agricultural return and it's not due till 30 September. So we have to create a whole additional workflow for that. Yeah, even though it is a different cube or base data but it is reconciled back to the finance loans return.

Karl Blackler: But yeah, so that because otherwise you'd have to keep it open for months and months, wouldn't you?

Michael McIntyre: That's right and we are similar to beyond Bank and Bank of Australia, I think it's just mentioned. So we would close certainly for quarterly. We would do that just after we've submitted on the 28th and then lock it down before the software update. We did have a glitch once, but just yeah, so we can open a new workflow. So yeah, so we've obviously well and truly locked down 30 June and done July and we're still waiting. We haven't finished reviewing 750. Our sign-offs are really on extracts, say Excel extracts of the data quality reports and documentation that way. So we're not really using the workflow to formally sign off.

Kerri McCarron: We do our 750 early and submit it two months early. Just so we don't have to do that.

Michael McIntyre: Well done. I don't know how you go with if you have 50,000 different ANZIC codes or anything, but and states. But yeah, it’s hard. Yeah, that's essentially what we do lend to farmers.

Karl Blackler: Now, Trent, you haven't said much here and that's because at the moment you're not really doing many quarterlies, I assume, Is that right?

Trent Bennett: That is exactly right. We, only have our monthly returns in CoreBIS at the moment. So we don't have these problems. So I'm most, most interested to hear about them of course, but we don't have these problems. That's correct.

Bree Stickens: Do you have multiple dates of submission though for your monthly forms and does that cause problems?

Trent Bennett: No we are ok, so a little bit like what Kerri hinted at earlier with our EFS one and two forms, and they'll typically be due on around the 14th and the 21st of the month. We'll simply have that second lot submitted at the same time as the first lot. Yeah, and get it all done at that time.

Bree Stickens: So you have the same problem. It's just a week out, not a month out or something.

Trent Bennett: Fairpoint. Yes but it is using much of the same data, but we're certainly completing those forms early, I suppose. I am curious as to what, some of you were doing when you're keeping the workflow open and able to make changes later. Are you somehow getting an XML file?

Karl Blackler: It's producing it off the working version Trent instead of the final version.

Trent Bennett: Can you produce an XML file off of the working version? Can you?

Karl Blackler: Yes.

Trent Bennett: Ah, never had to do that, so I didn't know that. OK, I understand how you're doing it now. OK,

Karl Blackler: Yeah, there's an optional selector on the OK export screen. So I would be keen to know if while you leave it open that whole time, do you actually reload any of the data after you've reviewed and checked those monthly forms? Or is it just simply open as a just in case you need to change something?

Kerri McCarron: Normally the only data that we would refresh would be the balance sheet and profit and loss when the backdated entries are done and then we don't do anything after that. But with the 112 in there now and and you've built that adjustment sheet for us, we will potentially, in a merger situation we'll have, we might not have all that data for the quarterlies from the merging entity up front. So it it can get, it can possibly get rerun some of the manual updates that we do like for merging some of which we do through the manual adjustment that you built in, the others we do through the manual input sheet. So yeah, it gets a bit trickier when we're mid merger.

Karl Blackler: Anyone else wanna contribute? Or should I pick on some people?

Champsman Yung: Before you call me out. So for the quarterly in general it's unlikely we end up reloading you know whole amounts of cube data but we might if we notice I think well firstly we've only been live for the quartarlies for only a short period of time. So we've only had a couple of reporting periods. But I think currently where we have noticed some data issues, it's usually more likely a mapping thing from our side and we're generally just putting through a manual adjustment to sort of correct it as a tactical solution, but no in terms of, you know, wholesale reloads of the data. It's just hasn't happened to date and, in my mind, unlikely to happen.

Karl Blackler: Yeah, Yep, So you're not reloading data per se, but you might be adjusting mapping. And you maybe reloading the tagged cube if you're updating tagging as well.

Champsman Yung: I think sometimes we find that we might tag or need to update some tagging and then it might have an unexpected movement in, you know a dependency somewhere else. And maybe it's just the way we structured our tagging. And then you know if we're right up against the time constraint, then we typically would just manually adjust that knowing what the right answer should be and then when we have the benefit of time we will actually look at sort of fixing the tagging at the right level.

Kerri McCarron: Yeah, we do that too. I think with the quarterlies, if we find something that the tagging, or the mapping needs to be changed and we've got the time to do it. Rather than do a manual adjustment, we'll do it and then reload the tag cubes. But the base cubes rarely change. It's only if something's gone badly wrong in the data capture. Really. The base cubes don't change too much,

Karl Blackler: So it sounds like I was on the right track with what most of you do. So just which is good. So some of the items that we have considered in the proposal that we're going to put forward to you guys in a minute, was having multiple submission versions, so one for your monthlies, one for your quarterlies, so you can lock down one, leave one open. I think that just, you could have an explosion of versions, you could have to load data twice for the same sort of periods and so forth. And it becomes harder from a reconciliation perspective. So we've kind of discounted that to a certain extent. Another thing we were considering was allowing you to unlock the data. So at the moment we can lock down the data at the start of the process, but maybe, if you find something, you can unlock it and then redo some of those changes. Now just that simple step means that you're going have to recheck all of the data that that is affected by reloading, etc. So again, it's, a bit dicey in terms of you know, forms that are supposed to be submitted could potentially still change. The other thing we thought about was allowing you to keep the data open, but when you make changes, you basically are putting it to a new version, and then you check to see what's changed between them and then effectively accept that version and remove the previous one. So you're you're always accepting any changes that are coming through. Again that would have been very complicated to get working and and a little bit dicey. So we've tried to keep it within how the system already works. We'll take you through how we think it should work now. I'm going to get Bree to take you through it, and then I'm gonna interrupt her constantly and **** her off.

Bree Stickens: OK. So obviously, Karl has just gone through the current process, how the workflow works at the moment and the initial thoughts were that the workflow and the process would be more data-driven and that you would sign off your data and then you'll do your forms.
But obviously in practice that's not the case, it's probably more form-driven. Everyone kind of looks at their data in terms of a form as opposed to in terms of data as a whole. So in coming up with a proposal for fixing or changing the workflow, we really want to keep in mind the risks that we're trying to prevent and to be able to enable people to be able to use it in the way that it's meant to be used.

So that you can actually have a working workflow where you can have a reviewer and submit it to the approver but still use it in a way that it's meant to be and not kind of get around it so that it's easier and more convenient and that sort of thing.
So what we have proposed, is that you don't have to lock the data at the beginning to enable your review and approval of the forms, which is kind of the to sort of overall change. So the new process would be the same at the beginning. You would load your cubes, you're base and tagged cubes, you would review your data, your new element reports, your changes in tagging reports, and your data reconciliation reports. You could review your forms at that point and at this stage you don't need to review or approve or lock the data off. It will still be available for updates and change. So then when you review your form, the reviewer, whoever that is, has reviewed their form. They they're happy with it. They they can make their manual adjustments. If they need any manual adjustments, they submit it for review. And at that stage it will create a submitted version which is locked in values. So the approver will get a values version of your form so that if you do keep going back and changing your data, the version that you've sent to your approval doesn't change. So they don't say, well, why did you send me this form with this number? And you say, well it didn't have that number before, but it's changed since I sent it to you. So the approver will have a values version of the form to review & sign off. And then depending on your process, it will either submit to APRA automatically once the approver approves or the third level person will do the submit to APRA step of the workflow and then at that point, it'll then go to the final.

So, you've done your work, and your form is due on the 14th through that process and then you come to the next week and you're doing your next level of ESFS forms. You have the opportunity to review your data again, update your tagging, update your mapping, and then we're going to introduce this new report for you to review which you have called the data movement report which will allow you to review your working version of your data and forms with your already submitted versions to APRA. So you can generate your next level of EFS doing the working version with the links to the data. And then you can compare that to your submitted version of the 1st monthly form. So you can see whether or not your updates to tagging, mapping or base data have actually impacted your already submitted data to APTA, which I think is missing at the moment. It's quite difficult to sort of clearly see what changes it would have impacted already submitted forms.
So then for those forms, you go back through the same process. You do your manual adjustments, review it, approve it, submit to APRA and then at the end of the month, once you've done all of that, you can then lock your data after you've reviewed the Data Movement report, which will show you changes between your working version and your submitted version. And then you can approve those. Or if you need to, you can create a resubmission version if the changes between the working versions were significant enough that you thought you needed to resubmit to APRA. Alternatively, if you came up with a change in the working data over this process, you could undo your tagging or mapping, or change it in a certain way so that all of your data is still the way you want it to be for across your different levels of forms. SO for this proposed changed you'll review the data. The form submission won't be dependent on the data locking so you don't have to wait for data to be locked to review and submit your forms. The working version will be able to be updated throughout the reporting period. Your submission version will be converted to values not linked to the data so that that submission version will always reflect what you actually submitted and what you did submit to APRA. And then what will be in CoreBIS is will be what you've actually submitted to APRA in D2A. The change here is pretty much that the working version will be linked to unlocked data. There is still going to be a risk here that your values can change. You may not want them to, and you'll need to be more mindful of the changes that you've made, because there won't be a version available of the prior version that directly links if you've changed it. So if you've changed it, you need to be careful of what you've changed and how you've changed it so that if that wasn't what you wanted, you can go back to a prior tagging version.

Karl Blackler: Does that make sense to everyone. So if if I've done the 720 and I've submitted that it's going to be values only as soon as my reviewer submits it so that my approver always sees the same number, they don't change. They can't make any adjustments to it. All they can do is go yes or no. If it's a no, then they'll reject it back to the reviewer, which will then push it back to the working version which is fully linked again, do any adjustments, reload data, do whatever they need to do, and then they submit it again for approval. The worry here is if they submit it for approval and then they update some data and that live link data changes considerably, then there's a difference between what they've submitted and what they their data is now saying. And when I I won't be able to drill back into the numbers on my approved version because it'll say 20,000. I'll drill back and it'll say 30,000 in my in my detailed data. So because it is a difference between working and approved. There's a lot of quietness around the room. Does anyone wanna go first or do I have to pick on some people? Kerri's in first with a hand up.

Kerri McCarron: You know, I always have questions. OK, just looking at this, what you've got up at the moment.

Karl Blackler: We tried to make it look a bit nicer with some bubbles and things, but we gave up

Kerri McCarron: In the very bottom row, the locked data. Why do you need to do a review data movement again then?Is there some? Because if you're doing it after you've done any updates and in tagging or or data at line 1234, and then you do some more submits, what is it looking? Is it looking for the same thing or is it the same? Or is it checking for something different?

Karl Blackler:I think we suggest it later on as well as adding an additional line in your workflow. Yeah, that sort of signs off that data movement report. So there's like an action to say, I have checked it, I accept any variances. I guess that's kind of where we, we were heading with that. Hopefully there wouldn't be any variances but you know, yeah.

Kerri McCarron:OK. So it's a final online sign off?

Karl Blackler:Pretty much. Yeah. To say that there are some differences between your live data and what you've submitted but they are right.

Kerri McCarron: Second question which isn't really a question, but more of a comment just at the moment. Let's just say that sometimes the people who are approving for submit to APRA are probably not those same people who are most familiar with Corbies. So depending on how it looks in terms of the various versions and in the workflow and that sort of thing, depending on how complicated that is from a looks point of view it it there might be some issues from that from that point of view. But until I saw it, I couldn't. I couldn't say, but I could just see other people being people who are working in it all the time should be fine with this. But the people who aren't working in it all the time would possibly find it a bit confusing if they're if it's if there's multiple versions showing on workflow or anything like that.

Karl Blackler:So the the reason we've gone with this proposal is because it uses the same versions you've already got. So we we already have a working as submitted and a final. It's just we're using them in a different way. Yeah, in a way that actually makes sense at the moment, that they kind of don't make sense to a user. If you open up a task, it knows what version it needs to show to you. So from a user perspective, but look at exactly the same. Again another reason why we've we've tried to go down this road.

Bree Stickens:Do the Approvers approve much in CoreBIS at the moment. Given that the workflow iskind of left at the end, or do they? Is it more of a just a press the button?

Kerri McCarron:A bit of both. They do review it and it depends on who the approver is. One, yeah, one is quite comfortable with it and we'll do drill downs and things like that themselves. The other is a little less comfortable and you know will usually ask us For more information rather than drilling down himself and and we'll spit it out indoor spreadsheet or something and and send through. So it does so, but it is a little bit of a mixture of both I guess at the moment. And then of course we have, we do have a like a then a visual check between what's actually in D2A, once we send it across sort of thing. That's a that's the final check I guess is that we do that in D2A as well. So that's an extra step, cause sometimes things do go wrong in the the file transfer. Yeah, it's not normally a Corbis problem.

Bree Stickens:Yeah, cause I guess the other change potentially is having to have approve is available at the time of submission. I don't know whether the current process they actually signed it off when it's due or because obviously it's not being done in CoreBIS when it is due. But whether you're process outside coreBIS is done at the time of submission.

Kerri McCarron:We have got aour approvers fairly well trained in that they have to put a comment into the say into the notes section on the workflow saying approved and their initials and the date. So otherwise we don't submit. So that's how we've sort of got around that. But the problem is, is that anyone can come along and type over those notes.

Karl Blackler:Or go and put it an adjustment in or change the data or. Yeah, nothing, nothing locked down, right.
Well, who else can I pick on?
Haven't heard from Lisa for a while, What does Lisa think of this process?

Lisa Beutel:It sounds like our process is very similar to everybody else on the call. In terms that we leave that final step until after we've actually submitted to D2A, I think we only load the base data once, but then there is a potential to reload the tag cubes and particularly when you're looking at differences for not differences, but just trying to reconcile the monthly and the quarterly returns.

Karl Blackler:OK.
Yeah. Thanks. Thanks Lisa. I I would be keen to know that yes, everyone on the call leaves it to the last minute. Do they actually want to fix it though? Are they opened the fixing OK, doing it a different way or is everyone happy doing it that way?

Lisa Beutel:I think it would be good to have the monthly data in particular lockdown while we're still got the workflow open for quarterly.

Kerri McCarron:Yeah I would prefer to have it locked down, but we we tried that and it didn't work for practical reasons. So if this looks like it would work and you have got the benefit that it is locked down, the only thing is, as I said, sometimes you do find a an error in your original ones that you've already submitted and then you'd have to end up doing a resubmission workflow.

Bree Stickens:Do you resubmit to APRA after the error? Or is it just errors and you just leave it in?

Kerri McCarron:We'd resubmit it through D2A and and do the adjustments in Corbis. Yeah, if we haven't already locked it off, but if we have have locked it off, we have to do a resubmission workflow.

Karl Blackler:The the other thing we were considering was having one workflow for the period and then. So if you've done a submission on a form, and you need to do a resubmission, then that line would effectively turn resubmission instead of the whole having a whole thing for resubmission.
We thought that might have been too much of a change at this point to action like would this change at least is a bit. You know, it's boxed. We already have all the versions in place we need, it's just the way that they work. Whereas that's a little bit more extreme having the because we're basically saying that the workflow is not version specific and then different versions interact with that, which is a little bit different because if we did it that way then it would be you wouldn't have to go through creating a whole resubmission. You could literally just reject the submitted workflow and it would create a resubmission or flag it as resubmission. Does that make sense? Yeah. I won't go there.

Kerri McCarron:The main issue around the resubmission workflow is the time it takes to reload your data again. So if you are able to do a resubmission workflow without having to reload all your base data again, that would take a lot of the time out of that sort of thing.

Karl Blackler:So in your workflow screen, in the data selections is a yes no flag for each of your data sources so you can make it equal your submission if you want.

Kerri McCarron: There is?

Karl Blackler:Yeah, it has been there for almost a year now, I think. So you suggested it. After you suggested it.

Kerri McCarron:Well see. You don't tell me when you do these things, Karl. So is that both base and tagged?

Karl Blackler:It'll only be from a tagged perspective. So when you're doing a resubmission, you can say my loan book, I wanna be referencing my submission data. My deposits will be submission data, but my GL might be my resubmission. So I can reload my GL, but the other cubes can all stay as what they previously were. Reloading your loans and deposits and things generally is not required, you know?

Kerri McCarron:Yeah, and it takes forever. So yeah.

Karl Blackler:OK. Funny. You guys upgraded?

Kerri McCarron:I believe you're working on it. Yeah. I'll look at that. Thank you

Trent Bennett:Karl and Bree,with this workflow that has got the potential to have results in a submission to APRA that might be different subsequently if new data is loaded or tagging or mapping is changed. Would there be any way to understand which data, which tagging and which mapping that submission to APRA version used? But we've we've got the data movement that we can review if we understood there were differences. Is there a way then to understand what the source of that submission was? Or would there not be a way to be able to identify that?

Bree Stickens:That is what the current workflow process does. It makes sure that you have different versions of data there that you can review. This one you wouldn't necessarily have that, but you would still have the the prior version of tagging that you could review and could go back to, but it wouldn't specifically say to you the submitted version was based on this version and the current version is using this new version.

Trent Bennett:OK. So now, assuming that it was data that had changed, that there'd be no way of knowing what data made up the original submission or the first submission. So. So in the situation where there were changes but not big enough to warrant a resubmission, we'd we'd have something that was submitted to APRA and no way to get those numbers back within CoreBIS is, that right? Based on this workflow.

Karl Blackler:Yes, but we're saying it's better than the other way around, which is you've submitted something to APRA and you've got some other number in CoreBIS, and they don't reconcile.

Trent Bennett:It is both the same though, isn't it?

Karl Blackler:At the moment, you don't submit it. In your workflow, you continually loading data to get your quarterlies working, and it inadvertently might change your monthlies. Where as at least this way, if that's what people are doing, locking down your monthly so that they don't change. So at least you've gotta you've got a baseline and you can compare against it.

Trent Bennett:Yeah, yeah, I understand. I mean, again, this is not as big a problem for teachers as as it might be for others. My initial feeling is that I'm uncomfortable with a system that provides a report that is submitted, but I can't get back to those numbers to understand those numbers subsequent to that is is my initial feeling. But I understand why.

Karl Blackler:Well the good thing about this process is because we won’t force you like you, could still lock all the data before you submit anything. Yeah if you wanted to keep using the process as it is now you can you can continue down that road I all all we're doing is allowing you to do forms without without locking the data. I know I was like, how do I keep track of everything? I wanna know everything that was when I submitted that data, what all the versions were and the amount of additional data points and things we would have to keep in the background. Well yeah, could explode, right? And then things won't reconcile anyway, like cause if you're using, you've got reconciliations and validations between forms like, you gotta keep them pretty similar to one another, otherwise you're gonna get errors down that path anyway. So, yeah.

Bree Stickens:The other thing is everyone sort of said that they don't reload based, they don't make a lot of changes through the period. So I mean, I would expect that you would have an idea of what you've done if something's changed. So you could say, on the movement report this number has changed because I changed the tagging on the loans cube for this dimension. Or yeah, you know, we've got the records of the different base data loads. I reloaded the base data and I reran tagging because then the question becomes, you know, why is it different? Should it be different? Yeah should you change your tagging so that your form goes back to what it was that you've submitted but your new form gives you the right number as well.

Trent Bennett: Yeah yeah fair points, fair points. It a tricky little issue. I know that one of the main or major reasons that we adopted CoreBIS was for the auditability of it for the enhanced controls it provides. It seems to me like this change the workflow is loosening that up a little bit.

Karl Blackler:The thing is the other way I'm gonna say it's the other way around. I'm gonna say that we've got all these controls but no ones using them because they don't want it to lock down. They don't want to control it,

Trent Bennett: Assuming that workflow is being used the way it was intended. Um. And I appreciate the reasons for why it may not be used that way by some clients. Then it would be tight. I just again appreciate that we don't quite have the same problem that other clients do. But
it seems to me that we to be, to be perfectly blunt, I would have to explain some auditors. Yeah, that the system allows us to change data after a form submitted and it just doesn't feel like it's sort of system should let you do. I don't know as I said that's just my initial feedback or feeling anyway.

Bree Stickens:Did you not say earlier that you don't submit your day 14 ones until day 20

Trent Bennett:We submit the day 20 ones on day 14. So there can be no changes which sort of necessitates submitting early. Yeah that's that's good. And again just because of the control there that like, but again I'm I'm not judging anyone. I appreciate the complexity here that other clients have, I just don't like the idea of a system that relaxes that a little bit but pragmatically I understand why some clients might prefer that.

Karl Blackler: Kerri have you still got your hand up?

Kerri McCarron:I have another question, sorry. Does it mean that once everything in the workflow is signed off all the forms and all the returns have been submitted and they say we're now in August and someone said and for some reason someone wanted to go back to the May workflow and drill down on it. Does that mean we wouldn't be able to drill down on on any workflow once it's been closed off drill down on the form?

Karl Blackler: No. So, if you if you submitted your form to the approval state, it's values only at that point yes. But, if you look at your data movement report, if there's no difference between your working and your submitted version, when I drill down on my submitted version, it's gonna give me the same number.If there is a difference in my data movement. So a attributes moved for some particular reason, if I drilled on 20,000 it might give me 25,000 because my working version is a differentmake up to my approved number.

Kerri McCarron:But you still, you still can drill down and get like all the accounts that are making up that number.

Karl Blackler:Correct. But it might be slightly different depending on what's happened to that data, yes?

Trent Bennett:Yeah. Or you might, you may lose data. If the data that you lose subsequent doesn't have those accounts, then they wouldn't, they wouldn't populate, right?

Karl Blackler:So it could go there, although they'll be they'll be going somewhere else. Basically you've moved them to go somewhere else, right?

Trent Bennett:So, so you drill down on the 20,000, but you might only see the 10,000, That makes up that 20 because the the other ten went somewhere else, right?

Karl Blackler:Yeah you drill down with 30 and it shows you 40 because. Yes. Yeah. But that's, that's why you've got that you'd want the data movement report so you can see where it had gone. And we'd be trying to flag it to somewhere to say there's some variances here. Please review please.
Yeah, I think that at the moment when people were not locking it and reloading data they are worrying whether the forms are changing, and they don't know it. Whereas this way is forcing it to say, well, the forms will not change and then you get to check to see if there are any differences anywhere. We would expect there to be no differences. AKA, that you don't go and rechange where you've tagged everything and make all these changes and and so forth, and all of a sudden what you've submitted is rubbish because that's not in your best interest. But yes, there's obviously a I wouldn't say it's a relaxation of control. I would say it's just an alternative. It is basically, you're taking a copy of it at a point in time, which is the point in time that you submitted it.

Kerri McCarron:Yeah, I think. I think if the review data movement forms were a mandatory step that couldn't be skipped over, that would probably address some of those concerns. And from our point of view on probably then say, well if it does affect any of the lodged returns, we won't do the mapping and tagging changes. We'll do a manual adjustment and do the mapping and tagging changes next month. And I think that's how how you would get around, and still have your controls.

Karl Blackler:Yeah, Lisa, you put your hand up.

Lisa Beutel:So in the review data movement report, is that sort of per attribute, per form or is it what information do we see there?

Karl Blackler:Yeah, we're only on slide 16 and 25, so it's probably keep going on the slide pack. Really good question. So let's keep going a little bit and then we can talk about it once we get to the end of the proposed change is still halfway through.

Bree Stickens:The proposal for the data movement report is that yes, it would be included in the workflow. So you do have to review the data movement report to finalise your workflow. The thinking is that we would do a higher level to begin with every form that you have submitted or has been submitted to APRA and compare that to the working version with the live data. And then obviously, we will need to, get the variance between attributes at an, absolute level so that they don't net each other out between attributes so that you can see that it was in 1.1 before and now it's in 1.7 or whatever the case is. And then there'll be comments there that say that you can drill down to their particular attribute, find out, what the number is.

Karl Blackler: Now continue on with the presentation and then we'll get there eventually, right.

Bree Stickens: Yeah, sorry, you wanna skip slide.

Karl Blackler:No So just we'll keep going with the presentation and then I think it's in two or three slides time we'll we'll start talking about it. So otherwise if we skip a few then we'll forget these ones and stuff. So it's just making sure we cover everything. OK.

Bree Stickens:Sorry, you lost me. Am I talking too much about this one slide?

Karl Blackler:Sorry, Um, no, you were talking about the data movement report, right, which is coming up in about 3 slides time. So I was just saying make sure we don't skip out over some things, right?

Bree Stickens:I'm on slide 20. Am I doing my own thing? Is it not working?

Karl Blackler:I think you're doing your own thing.

Bree Stickens:Oh, OK can I change the slides? I'm doing my own thing. That makes sense. OK. Do you have to change it for me?

Karl Blackler:Um, I think because I've presented it, I'm OK. Yeah. So we're on slide 18. OK.

Bree Stickens:I'm on slide 20 please. That makes more sense. That makes more sense about what Kerry was saying before now, too. Can you skip to slide 19, please?

Karl Blackler:OK. So, yeah, so we've talked all about this and right, which is basically we're gonna use the three versions for as they are intended to be used as opposed to just using them at the end of the process. And there's the report we're talking about. Yeah.

Bree Stickens:So what I was saying before is this report that we have proposed which will give you a high level total per form that has been submitted and then it will give you the working version with a live data compared to the values version and then the attribute. The attributes will be calculated absolute so that it will give you a variance for the form even if there's changes just between attributes, because otherwise you don't want to miss a potential movement between a category that is important.

Karl Blackler:And those two values are the same, right? But there's a variance.

Bree Stickens:Then you'll be able to see the individual attributes under the forms to see which one has the variance, And put in comments there. So that you can just say, OK, it's moving between categories, it's fine. Or like the bottom one, we need to resubmit it to APRA because of a change potentially.

Karl Blackler:That's what I mean to do. The laser pointer

Bree Stickens:You know what you have changed recently, like what tagging from having you can go back and revert the tagging and mapping back to the way it was and do a manual adjustment like Kerry said. Or potentially you can alter your tagging or mapping, or it wouldn't be mapping because it's the same mappings just form level. Change your tagging so that it fits in with your new quarterly forms as well as your monthly forms.

Karl Blackler:It could be the mapping as well you could change the mapping

Bree Stickens:But why would you change the mapping on a form that you've already done?

Karl Blackler:I don't know.

Bree Stickens:Ideally you want your tagging to fit with both your monthly and quarterly form. So if it doesn't work, then hopefully there's another better way of doing it so that next month, the quarterly and monthly are fine and your quarterly can still be fine too.
Next slide please. Alright, so this is where we sort of suggested, I guess this is another question we were going to raise about where in the workflow would we want, the data movement report to be? Do we want it to have its own section at the bottom? Do we still want to sign off data and lock data or individually or, just at a high level. But as I mentioned, the Data Movement report approval will be included in the workflow, so you do have to sign that off to finish the workflow. The data movement will only include forms that have been submitted for that workflow. IT will include your comments and as your data is not locked you can make changes to put it back the way it was to what you've submitted to APRA. If you've just got unexpected variances.

Next, so now we're gonna talk about, other possible enhancements to the workflow. Unless we wanted to talk more about data movement or the proposed changes to the workflow process.

Karl Blackler:Kerrie, you have got your hand up again.

Kerri McCarron:Yep, quick question,is the data movement report locked?

What will it do if you do more than one change? but you do a tagging change. Now you run the data movement report, All looks fine. Move on, you do another tagging change later.
Does it replace? Does it replace the original data? Movement report? Do you have multiple ones of them? Do you comments stay in there, that sort of thing?

Karl Blackler:Yeah. So the comments will always stay there for each each form.This column here is basically a working version so that's always live linked to your data. And then when you submit one of these forms, you would have either your submitted version here or your final version. Most probably your submitted version would be showing here which would be values only. So when you're updating your data, these values here may change, which would then change the variance, so you would go why? Why is the form that I just submitted saying it's this amount, my working versions now saying this amount? The tagging change I just made obviously stuffed that up. So you either go back revert that tagging change, or you'd live with it or you would look at doing a resubmission. So you might go, well that's that variance is too big a a deal. I need to do a resubmission on that.

Kerri McCarron:Yep. OK, so, so but say this time come, you've done this and you said, you put your comments in ,you've said, no, we're not going to do the tagging changes. Or, yeah, we're going to accept it and do a resubmission, but then you do some more tagging changes somewhere else. A bit later you have to rerun this report Is it a whole fresh new one? That's only based on what or does what was originally there stay there.

Karl Blackler:Just live with whatever was there. Live with whatever's now. So, the idea, I guess, is that this data movement report is an ongoing thing.

OK. So you're locked down a form, and then you might rerun data and you'll check and go everything is ok. Something's moved or no, everything's still in. And uh, kosher,take it off, move forward, keep going. Or yes. I know that there was a change and and my change has made a difference here because of blah blah blah, which is insignificant in the grand scheme of things. I'm not gonna worry about it or. It's made a change. I'm gonna have to resubmit this one.
Yeah, look, the resubmission one, because you've already submitted that monthly one, you've resubmitted a different time.
One person we haven't heard from is Hannah. What does Hannah think of this? Or James, I guess.

Hannah Kipp:Thanks, Karl.
I guess I would be supportive of this change as long as we had a, I guess, trail of knowing when our later changes actually impact past results. Because right now I guess that is a risk. For example if I'm reviewing a return and the tagging and mapping has changed and the previous months hasn't been updated. Or at least I'm using the submission to APRA and it looks like we have a large movement I think and I have to ask you know, James and my team for an explanation. I think this would help limit those questions and we would know like when we truly need to resubmit to APRA or if it's small enough to live with. So I'd be supportive of this movement screen.

Karl Blackler:Yeah, cool. Thank you.
Any more questions on the data movement report, we'll move on.

Champsman Yung:Sorry, might be a dumb question, but, I think in the next slide we said that the differences are absolute. And sorry briefly if I missed this, but that basically means that the variance we're seeing here on this page is effectively double any actual movement.

Karl Blackler:Yes. So you can see here that the values are actually the same between these two. And because there's a variant here, it means that we've had like 6 like it's really, really small. But for me, I think we have 6 million that's gone out somewhere and six million that's gone in somewhere. So rather than showing that a zero and going, no, everything's great, we're showing it as 12.

Champsman Yung:Yes. OK, Yep. Cool.

Karl Blackler:And the the other way we were thinking of doing it was having the variants work the same way, but having a flagnwhich says 16 variances or three variances or something like that and actually just have a count of how many things are different. Yeah. So then that way the total level it's saying zero, you're going well, it still in in the total, so it's not as bad, it's only a few movements and categories.

Champsman Yung:So I guess in terms of, I think ac ount would actually be useful. Um, if that's easy to add, I think you know, because then it'd be pretty obvious if it's just got a count of two. But I guess in terms of actually investigating this thing like the variances. So would you just be going to the movement sort of the the trend analysis whatever report and sort of selecting the two versions and then seeing at which individual element level on each form has changed or can you drill down from here?

Bree Stickens:Yeah, the plan will be that you can drill down from here. This is just the high level view at the form level, but then underneath that will be all of the attributes that make up that those forms. So you'd have to expand it outwhichever ones have variances and you can just ignore.

Karl Blackler:Or, you know, click on one and go look at the individual form or something and it'll blast it out that way. Yeah, so. So if we had the count here of variances, would we still want the variance as being, absolute? Or do we want it to be the just an ordinary variance?

Champsman Yung:Then I think it's still useful to have it as absolute cause then you sort of see the magnitude because if you just had a count of two and then variance, if you netted them off, then you go OK, it's fine. But if they've moved by 10 million each way, you might still need to explore a resubmission. So you still wanna know.

Karl Blackler:Yeah. Well, the, I guess the count is alluding to the fact that there has been a change,but as you said, the variance here of 12 million is double what it actually is, right? I don't know. Is it good or bad? I don't know.

Champsman Yung:I guess in my mind it's probably better to over investigate that under

Karl Blackl:Yeah, OK, cool. Like this laser pointer thing. That's pretty cool. OK. So some of the other things that we discussed to be building in to this at the same time. So the first one is something that Kerry actually brought up, which is for each of our forms having a a permanent comment or permanent notes section. So if there's some assumptions that you've made or that you want to capture and and have available, to be able to click on a form and and drill into the notes on that form and have something that's always there. It's basically just a note. You'll still have period notes, which would be the same as the one that's in the in that column at the moment. So we have some permanent comments and that would be at the form level, not the form entity level, so just the form level. I thought about this, I though, well if it's at the form level you can always put comments to say level 1, Is this level 2? Is that in the comment itself? So I think we don’t need to worry about the entity itself.

The second one there is, do we add a started or an in progress status? So if I've started looking at a form as a reviewer, there's no way at the moment to know that I've started looking at it or that I'm reviewing it at this point in time. So to have something there to say, Yep, I'm looking at this at the moment or I'm reviewing this might, you know, just give you a little bit more information to know that five of them are started or that you know you're in progress with them. Is that something that people would see beneficial? Bearing in mind that you would actually be using the workflow now, not waiting till the very end to submit everything.

Kerri McCarron:We do that at the moment in the notes section. So like whoever started it puts underway ready first approval like we do that it's sort of in the notes section anyway. So I know people like Chris like that because they, you know keep an eye on what's going on sort of things. So and how far forward we are in that. So formalising that with coloured lights or whatever, whatever it is you do, yeah, would be great. From our point of view. It fits in with what we do in practise.

Karl Blackler:We also want to add some colourful lights and little icony things, tick boxes and stuff, just to make it look a little bit more nicer. And at a glance you can see where the progress is. Looking at the tasks as opposed to trying to look at that comments view, which is a little bit here or there, especially if you haven't got security.

The third thing is to filter the task by user. So if I come in at the moment, generally it's security filtered at the moment, so you only see the ones that you're in charge of. But as an administrator, you don't always know, who's doing what. So to be able to say give me Jim's, tasks and filter, is that something of use or or not really?
No. Yes, do I have to pick on someone.

Trent Bennett:Sorry, you've lost me there. The filter would be for the user to be only able to select a task they should only be able to execute. Or is this from the point of view of the administrator who can see what the user is using?

Karl Blackler:Yes. So I guess if Jim logs in, he's only going to see the tasks that he has security to. So as a user selector is probably not going be much use to him. Aa a workflow administrator though, I might want to go give me all the Jimmy's task to see if he's started or if he's under way.

You're probably gonna want see it the other way around though, maybe. These are the list of tasks, who are assigned to these ones and the ones that are falling behind. You might want to see morethan the other way. Unfortunately some what a bit difficult to do that because to show it the 2nd way which is task and user because you've got multiple users, assigned to tasks. So you, you know, who am I waiting on? Could be three different people. So it's not always immediately obvious

Trent Bennett:From our point of view then, we've got very few users of Corbis and it's generally pretty well understood who does what. So for us in practise at the moment that would have limited use. But that's just us.

Kerri McCarron: Yeah, I think we're a bit the same. We have a morning meeting and everyone kind of does. I'm doing this. I'm working on that. I'm stuck on this. We did and we sort of manage it that way. People who have got more users would probably like it.

Karl Blackler: Improved metrics on a dashboard? So knowing where you're up to in the process at the moment, the dashboard's a little bit clunky, I suppose. Does anyone use it? Would anyone use it? You would probably just use the detailed task list, right?

Kerri McCarron: Yeah, because we don't sign things off as we go. The dashboard doesn't really help.

Karl Blackler: Would you look at it if you did sign it off as you went along?

Kerri McCarron: Yeah.

Karl Blackler: So maybe we'll leave that after we implement the change, because then you'll look at it and go, well, that doesn't look good. Or it does look good. Or whatever, you know, look at it at that point.I've got here alerts and or Slas around task sign off date. Is that of interest? You know, do we want to highlight things two days before they are due or or send emails out or on the landing page, do we want to put just a simple alert saying warnings, forms are due in two days or something like that? Like, is there anything, what can we think of around that ? What would people want?

Trent Bennett:In principle, I really like the idea. It would be even better if we could email the alerts. So that it wasn't a requirement to have to log into Corbis, which? Not everyone is going to do necessarily so, but you're in principle really like that idea.

Kerri McCarron: Yep, I agree. Particularly if if you could even would be able to send alerts to perhaps non CoreBIS users who you're waiting on for data or something like that. That would be very handy because we send the emails anyway so to automate it would be great.

Karl Blackler: Yeah, OK. So on the third day of the month or something, if something hasn't been loaded, you would send an email? Or would you always send an email third day of month? Remember to save that file or something like that?

Kerri McCarron: We basically have a like a timelineand if things haven't been given to us by a certain date, we would send an email. So he's. So we basically send an email with a list of things at various points throughout the month that things are still outstanding.

Karl Blackler: OK.
That's based on working day? Or would it be based on Calendar Day?

Kerri McCarron: Working day

Karl Blackler: Would you have to maintain public holidays and things in your areas and stuff? Or would it not need to worry about that?

Kerri McCarron:Only if the public holidays, like the day before the due date or something like that, You know, like a really close sort of thing.

Karl Blackler: Yeah. I think at the moment we've got the idea of business days that we just count weekends, we don't worry about public holidays. But yeah, we could adapt.

Trent Bennett: We would have managers, interested in working back from the due dates, you know X amount of days for each form to review that started or in progress status as well. So an alert to a manager that may be a non CoreBIS user alerting them that hang on a second, were are six days out and this still hasn't hasn't started. Yeah, something like that would be great too.

Karl Blackler: Update the order of the drop down menu for the working version, the workflow version so it's in reverse chronological order so you don't have to click and then scroll all the way to the bottom to click click the the latest one, etcetera. That's probably gonna be a must have for everyone I see.

OK, so that's that's it for our workflow changes. Opening up to anything else that you want to talk about now. I have taken notes from the CAB meeting of things like dimension hierarchy, snapshotting and things like that. So if you've raised it already then don't worry about it in this forum. It will be captured already. But if there's anything else that you want to bring up or any more questions about the workflow, please sing out, what? What do you think about the working group? What else could we be discussing and how often? Are you happy with quarterly or monthly?

Champsman Yung: My perspective, I think quarterly makes sense. I think unless there's a major issue or something where you can bring us all together for something.

Karl Blackler: OK, cool. Yeah. So we'll try and do a quarterly cab and then what we'll do is maybe a week or two after the cab we'll do a working group or even maybe a month different or something. So that way anything brought up in the cab we can discuss in detail in the working group. Then we don't have two meetings in the same month like this as well. So, if we did a quarterly and then a month out from the quarter for the working group, that might be a good way of doing it. As long as you're not afraid of having meetings with us, I'm happy with that.
Anyone else want to bring anything else up?

Trent Bennett: I'm curious as to whether anyone, again teachers hasn't had the opportunity to explore this at this point, but were there anyone's considered or played around with setting up workflows? For example, monthly workflow and a quarterly workflow. Has anyone toyed with that, did it work? Just just curious as to any feedback around that.

Karl Blackler: Yeah, so beyond bank I know did that at one point. The problem with that is you've got to load all your data twice. And anytime you make a change to tagging, you gotta make it twice. Because they're using independent versions. And if they're not, then you run into problems as well. So generally we, advocate to just do one workflow version at a time because otherwise you can miss changes and so forth.

Kerri McCarron: Yeah, OK. I think, I think we did it the first two quarters and then I said never again.

Trent Bennett: So now when you were doing it though, were you working on both workflow versions concurrently or had you finished the monthly one before commencing the quarterly one?

Kerri McCarron: We had finished the monthly.

Michael McIntyre: So we actually do a not separate for quarterly but as I mentioned before for the 750 agricultural lending return, but a suggestion would be Karl with the resubmission you can copy your data across and mapping, tagging whether because we would, yeah, we need a separate version I suppose but I used ad hoc this time but realised I couldn't do the same thing. I'd rather not call it a re-submission as a preference. So we could have the same same radio button to copy the data across as an ad hoc?

Karl Blackler: Yeah, that one's an interesting one. That one, isn't it? Cause it is the same. It's just way, way, way in advance.They have to do it later.

Michael McIntyre: I mean we have, everything pretty much the same data. It's almost work day three and it is the same customer level data, but it's the data quality checking and and analysis and yeah, so we leave that to after quarter end

Karl Blackler: You would reload your loan data effectively for that process?

Michael McIntyre: Yeah. So I had it all loaded for June and so the return was draft essentially there and the 30 June workflow. And then we wanted to obviously sign off on our monthly and quarterlies and submit that version off, but then want to copy it all across. So if I was able to just do that, I mean it's a separate cube, but we reconcile back to the 720 and the loan return. So because it's the same totals for the two RFCs. It's just it's never going to be a short process to check.

Karl Blackler: Because the issue is if you have a different version, you can't then do a reconciliation either within the same version, because the rec's always are within the same version. So you would have to like do a resubmission for all your previous forms and your Agricultural forms, so that way you can see.

Michael McIntyre: I bring in the 7:20, so then I can use the rec report to reconcile the line total. But it's not a resubmission. Because it's sort of flashing lights for auditors.

Karl Blackler: Interesting one, that one. Yeah. So this change in workflow would probably suit you, actually, because you'll be able to sign off all of your data except for that one. And then finish all your forms and then it can just sit there until two months later and then you can just reload the data. So would actually work better for you. Then you wouldn't need another version. As long as you lock down the other data. So when you rolled it over to the new month, everything was locked.

Michael McIntyre: So that's all my submitted returns, all the tagging and mapping. Rolls over and uses the same version.

Karl Blackler: Yep, Cause you've locked down that data. So you'd have to make sure you do that.

Kerri McCarron: In 12 months time, when you're doing the new annual one, if you've done any tagging changes, would they have rolled through?

Karl Blackler: No, they wouldn't. But but no, this is, this is specific on the one data source, for that one form. So he's basically got one data source for the one form. So he wouldn't submit that one.

Michael McIntyre: And then we purposely chose to, well, it's the same underlying data. We do have extra fields for the agricultural return. We purposely created a separate cube for that. So I think that was good design.
Flexibility.

Trent Bennett: What? What are next steps then will you? Based on today's discussion, have you got enough to, make some changes? Uh, sort of prototype that. How do you go forward from today.

Karl Blackler: It's a great question. I guess out of this meeting we got feedback that you're happy to continue with it. Which is good. There wasn't anyone saying no other than maybe you're self Trent but understand, understanding that you can still lock down the data before you do the forms. That functionality will not change. Feel like we've got answers to everything, uh, that we posed. Like things like adding the data movement report into the workflow. Is that something that we would want to do or not? Or is it just like a task off to the side?

Kerri McCarron: No, it's I'd like it in the workflow. I think that's good. People can't miss it.

Trent Bennett: I think it has to be there too.

Karl Blackler: So having this additional whether it's part of data or whether it's sits by itself, that's neither here or there. But as long as it's available, so people can click on it and look at it and sign it off. So that you enforce the fact that you have looked at it, you've checked it, you're happy with it?

Trent Bennett: Yeah, Prior to data being locked down. I think if you could build that check in, yeah.

Karl Blackler: Would you actually want to submit it and assign users to it?

Michael McIntyre: Can we have optionality so we can choose whether to in the setting up, whether we do need it or not?

Karl Blackler:Now we're getting technical. Yeah. We could build that in. We could even toggle to say whether you lock the data first as well.If the toggle was turned on, then you have to lock the data before you move on to the forms. If it's toggled off, then we can allow you to do the forms at the same time. Would that be an option?

Trent Bennett: Personally as as I've explained earlier, I think I think that's a good idea. I'd like to see that that way as an option. But, I'd be equally as comfortable without it. I think we can embed in our own process so that the data should be locked before we push on. Really.

Karl Blackler:Yeah, you wouldn't want those two things, linked. So if you toggle to lock the data first, you don't need the data movement report.

Trent Bennett: Conceptually, there'd be no need for it, right?

Karl Blackler:If we toggled to lock the data first, the system is still going to work the way that we're proposing. So we're still gonna have values only for submitted and so forth. Just because that would be far too hard toggle everything. It's just that the working versions not going to change because you know you've locked that data. I think we would also do things like once the form is submitted, it's at the approval stage, we would stop manual adjustments on the working version as well. So you wouldn't be able to do adjustments to those forms and we could probably stop, mapping to those forms as well. So we could easily toggle security so that people can't change the mapping on a form that's been submitted. Cause that really doesn't make sense.

So next steps would be, we would go into design mode and work out exactly what needs to be done to get it working while still incorporating all the existing enhancements and bugs and things that we're working on as well. So this would be a long-term new feature or change that we're putting in. So I would be expecting it either probably be the 1st of December or maybe even 1st of Feb depending on, how we go.

Trent Bennett: Would there be some sort of early adopt process where one or two clients test this more specifically before rolling out to all clients without client testing at all?

Karl Blackler:That's a good point. I think it would be nice to have a Guinea pig. I mean a client to work with.

Kerri McCarron: Could it be available in dev first?

Karl Blackler:Yeah, Yep. So, so we could have it as its own deployment maybe, and then we could work with you to see when you want to put it in. So that way it's not rammed in with the monthly updates. Because it is quite a large change and we will have to work on what we do with history. So we would have to probably, export out your submitted version at the moment and then load that back in as values only and things like that and adjust a few things here and there. So there are some migration steps to get everything working. Again, that's why we've kind of gone down this road as we are working within what we already have. We're not going way out and and and you know, we were talking, doing separate tagging versions and all sorts of stuff. So this, this way it works with what we already have. It's not too far away from that. While it seems quite major. I don't see it being as hard as what we think it will be. The hard bits kind of going through and designing it all which you know Bree and I have spent quite a bit of time going through saying is this possible, isthat possible and kind of crafting it so before we bring it to you guys. We wanna make sure it's possible.I'll be aiming, I'd be hoping to get it sort of first to December around that time frame, but I don't know there's a lot happening in the next few months for us at Cortell.

Kerri McCarron: It would probably be good to do it for a month end rather than 1/4 end the first time around just in case.

Karl Blackler:Well, I guess it's most benefits are at the quarter end, but yes, I understand what you're saying. If anyone has anything they want to add after, like if they get off the call and have any questions or something, then feel free to email either me or Bree.
But yeah, until next time thank you very much.