

HFM Security: Conversion to Groups



Ryan James Tutak
Senior Financial Analyst

30 November 2011

Our Beliefs:
Respect
Collaboration
Excellence
Integrity
Community



BWA (NYSE)

- Leader in powertrain technology e.g. turbochargers
- Recipient of 5 *Automotive News* Pace Awards
- Sponsor of Winner's Trophy for Indy 500 Race
- 2010 Sales \$5.7 billion, Net Income \$377 million
- Rank by revenue among U.S. firms by *Fortune*:
506 in 2005, 481 in 2007, 453 in 2009, 403 in 2011
- Annual operating profit each year since 1993 IPO
- Robin Adams rated 'Best CFO in Auto Industry'
in 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011 – *Institutional Investor*

BWA & Oracle / Hyperion

- HFM ~ 270 Users
- FDM ~ 180 Users
- Essbase (1 plant)
- Planning (1 plant, 2 at HQ)

Shared Services: common console for Security

All applications on version 11.1.2.1

HFM Permissions

Basis: Old Way

- Classes & Roles assigned to Active Directory Users
 - o *Rules Designer* granted to rtutak@borgwarner.com

Basis: New Way

- Classes & Roles assigned to Native Directory Groups
- Users put in Groups
 - o *Rules Designer* granted to 'Admin'
 - o rtutak@borgwarner.com added to 'Admin'

Implications of Change in Basis

- Daily Routines

POSITIVE

- Quarterly Review of Daily Routines

NEGATIVE

Daily Routines – I

- ~ 40 requests each month to add / modify / remove Users notably in China & Mexico
- Security easier to process with Groups

Daily Routines – II

Example:

A firm with 20 plants wants to add User to view all data

Old Way

User profile to be created:

<u>Class</u>	<u>Access</u>
Plant 01	None > Read
...	
Plant 20	None > Read

20 classes assigned User

New Way

Group 'All Plants' profile – current:

<u>Class</u>	<u>Access</u>
Plant 01	Read
...	
Plant 20	Read

User added once to Group

Quarterly Review of Daily Routines – I

- Audit requires User census like physical inventory counts:
4x (not 1x) year
- Comprehensive validation of everyone able to impact data
- Groups complicate this exercise

Quarterly Review of Daily Routines – II

For financial information:

HFM promises ‘one version of truth’

For profiles on providers of this content:

This standard fails to apply

Data on Security segregated in 2 places

The 2 Places

- HFM file:

- Groups & Users
- Classes
- Groups & Users with Roles
- Groups & Users with Classes

Extracted via Client / GUI or Workspace into .sec

- Shared Services file:

- Groups
- Groups with Members
- Roles for Users
- Roles for Groups

Exported via CSS utility in System 9 & LCM utility in System 11

Quandary – I

- For Daily Routines:

The less appealing method
(giving rights directly)
entails only 1 file because Groups not used

The more appealing method
(giving rights indirectly)
entails both files because Groups used

- For Quarterly Reviews of Daily Routines: 1 file simpler than 2

- Data for Groups: easier to create, harder to retrieve

Hyperion explicitly encourages – yet implicitly discourages – use of Groups

Quandary – II

- 1 file from HFM – still undesirable:
7,500 lines of direct rights for ~270 Users
- Onerous
- Extensive manual reformatting required
before circulation to BUs:
susceptible to error, fraud
- Process to control risks embodies risks

Plan A – I

- Objective

Rely on Groups with 1 (convenient) resource

- Means to End

Custom Report:

Merge content from HFM & Shared Services

Plan A – II

Concerns upfront over Custom Report:

- another tool subject to audit
- dependence on outsider for future support
- modifications to keep pace with Oracle

Plan A – III

Strategy:

Switch from User rights to Group rights
once Custom Report functions

Averse to deprovisioning ~ 270 accounts
until alternative proves viable
in tests on subset of IDs with new method

Plan A – IV

- Samples expected in Report trials absent
- We found program built around Users not Groups
i.e.
direct rights (not indirect rights) captured
- Product unable to flip to Groups from Users
- Rebuild required
- Project abandoned incomplete

Plan B – I

- EPM Maestro (UK) offers preset Report on Groups
- Used by 35 companies:
 - assurance of future availability
 - auditor familiarity
 - economy of scale:
 - enhancement requests beneficial to multiple customers accommodated
- Sections batchable for Divisions
- BUs can run Report to check Security proactively
- Already adapted for System 11
- Competitive with ‘salvage cost’ of Custom Report

Plan B – II

- EPM Maestro excellent for Quarterly Reviews
- Features requested for audit:
 - Show count & ID of Users in WORLD (system Group)
 - Total Members in Native Groups to tie to WORLD
- Features requested for convenience:
 - Insert blank columns for remarks
 - Suppress blank rows
 - List Group members alphabetically

Insights through EPM Maestro

- Trends in HFM community emerge:
 - Bigger plants, more Users : Smaller plants, less Users?
 - Where is growth – geographically, operationally?
 - Maximum number of Users with All access per location?
- ‘Active Portfolio Management’ now possible with Security

Design of Group Structure – I

165 Groups named on logic conducive to batching

- 1st split: Headquarters (HQ...) v Operations (Ops...)
- 2nd split: In Operations, 2 Segments:
Engine (OpsEng...) v Drivetrain (OpsDS...)
- 3rd split: In Engine, 5 BUs (Divisions) e.g. OpsEngTurbo...
- 4th split: In Division, BU or RU with Access Level:
 - OpsEngTurboBU_All
 - OpsEngTurboBU_Read

 - OpsEngTurboRU298_All
 - OpsEngTurboRU298_Read

Design of Group Structure – II

- HQ... & Ops... provisioned only with Default
- 3 universal Groups assigned Classes, Roles:
 - AllAudit: Actual (Read)
 - AllTesters: Actual (Read), Train (All)
 - AllUsers: Actual / Budget / Forecast (All)
- Groups not embedded on concern of inflexibility

Dual Administration: Security & System

- BWA lean:
No one dedicated to run only Shared Services
- Risk Acceptance Form signed
for audit over Segregation of Duties
- System 11:
Security Log details changes for transparency

Thank You

*feel good
about driving*



*better fuel economy
reduced emissions
great performance*