# Me

1. Follow the steps from [11 FRA Data migration\Questions & To Do.docx](file:///g:\_\My_Docs\Biz\_05\UN\11%20FRA%20Data%20migration\Questions%20&%20To%20Do.docx) except “- Find “?” wrong-font symbols in the DataFRA table”. It has been solved.
2. Keep in mind some notes from [12 LUB\Questions & To Do.docx](file:///g:\_\My_Docs\Biz\_05\UN\12%20LUB\Questions%20&%20To%20Do.docx).
3. Add primary keys to the pan\_european\_\* tables.
4. VBA validation program: Prevent entries such as “12 345” of Sweden’s 3.3 or “x,x – comma separated” of Georgia’s 3.2 in all the tables by checking numbers vs. texts.
5. 12 LUB Questions & To Do:

- The tables transferred from 2015 w/o data; their topics may change: 3.3, 3.4, 4.4b, 4.4c, 6.7, 6.8.

- When re-sorting the table codes maintain their matches in the SQL Server stored procedures.

- 3.5b: Unlike the original long title, the group is just “Area”.

- Check the italic table titles or the unchanged tables’ ones.

- Processing the textual tables 1.2c, 3.3: The previously available categories are presented only. Delete unreported ones. Add new either in-between the existing codes or delete all of them and place new ones on the bottom of the list of topic codes.

1. Check Vladik’s output tables updated for Moldova.

# Roman

1. Roman: Dear Cosimo,

Right now I have one question, as it presents the totals, did you discuss in FRA whether data will be presented there “as reported” by countries or you plan to fill gaps or other technique to improve comparability of presented figures?

I will send more comments in my answer to Alexander’s questions.

- Cosimo: The reported data won't be a simple aggregation of country data, but as you mentioned, the gaps will be filled. If you would like to learn more about the technical details about it, I will add Orjan to this chain.

- Roman: Thank you, actually it is important issue, at which we have to look a separately. It would be great if Orjan participates, but also Rastislav from the Forest Europe side…

1. *According to Rastislav’s demand, the data of Portugal, table 1.1a, year 2020 was copied from 2015 for the output tables. It enabled other calculations in the output tables dependent on the 2020 data copied. The national report was left unchanged as originally reported. Which version should migrate to FRA (and later on to the ENECE website via PCAxis): original OR modified?*

*(The Portugal national report attached: Pan\_European\_Questionnaire\_RespostaFinal - Portugal - 17.09.2019.xls)*

*(The output tables attached: Pan-European-2020-OutputTables 190919 1620.xlsx)*

- Roman: In the meantime please insert into a national report the 2020 data as demanded by Rastislav (marked as tbd), indeed Portugal reported forest area 2020 data to FRA and the pan-European data should be consistent. But let me check this with Rastislav, as in the end it is a national correspondent who decides which data is presented.

1. *Could you please consult on the following issue? The table below shows the number of rows in tables 4.4b & 6.10d. Those tables are extensible. National correspondents can add as many new rows as they need. The table summarizes such cases. Although we need to foresee that interface for the FRA platform.*

*Back in 2018 in the pilot phase, Cosimo suggested a simple solution just to reserve more rows. Initially, there are seven rows. We can extend them up to twenty, for example. Currently, I have reserved twenty. That is national correspondents will see all the twenty empty rows when they start filling in the tables.*

*Another solution might be some extensible interface. That will be one of the fine-tuning issues for the final realization. For example, the issue on "Codes vs. names of the categories" is one of them (see below in your message). Actually, Cosimo and I discussed it last Wednesday. The Excel list-box feature (to visualize selecting categories) is also technically feasible. Category codes (not names) will migrate and be stored. Although, the tables can present the values as codes or names. It depends on how we will organize them. So, please any ideas are welcome. Thank you.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Table* | *2015* | | | *2019* | | |
| *Rows initially* | *Country* | *Rows* | *Rows initially* | *Country* | *Rows* |
| *4.4b* | *7* | *Germany* | *17* | *7* | *France* | *8* |
| *Ukraine* | *12* | *Slovakia* | *8* |
| *6.10d* | | | | *6* | *Hungary* | *13* |

- Roman:

*Thank you (and Cosimo) for dealing with this issue, I think I understand the problem, but I do not have a sufficient knowledge to assess pros and cons of these solutions. As always I would support simplicity in these types of tools, where we will have many users with different backgrounds, and simple extension seems to be appropriate, but if we have a more advanced tool, safe and easy to operate, it would be welcomed. Perhaps we can talk directly to better understand these choices and their impact on the work done?*

*I was also thinking that having prototypes for possible choices would help to identify all pros and cons, and to choose the optimal solution.*

*- Alexander: Cosimo and I discussed the extensible tables 4.4b, 4.4c & 6.10d last Wednesday. For the start, we tend to keep it as simple as possible. So, we would like to just reserve twenty rows. An extensible interface (from initial six/seven rows to any number) is still technically feasible. We perhaps should resume it at the stage of the FRA platform realization. The migration makes no difference to it at the moment. Anyway, any suggestions are welcomed please.*

- Roman: I have no further suggestion on the extensible tables, I do not expect that more than 20 rows would be needed in the foreseeable future, also an extensive enlargement of the number of rows available for reporting would actually lower usability, comparability and visibility of these data.

1. Multiple n/a’s entered with UN\_12LUB\_PrepareDatabase?

# Cosimo

1. Share the new ddl & dml statements:

- drop if exists

- double precision

- some tables changed

1. The data are being checked.

# Kirusha

1. Compare National reports - Orig corrected vs. National reports

# Vladik

1. *Check 6.7-6.8 PostgreSQL tables.*
2. Check text entries with Word.
3. Check how Kirusha has substituted categories with codes in the text tables.
4. soef2020-67-68-tables-v2\_ - 6.7, 6.8 cleared.xlsx

# Rastislav

1. [The errors in the output tables.xlsx](file:///G:\_\apk\My_Docs\Biz\_05\UN\13%20FRA%20Data%20migration\The%20errors%20in%20the%20output%20tables.xlsx)