



## **EuSpRIG 2001 Conference Report**

Brian Pettifor: When performing model audits we never fail to find an error, but the world is not tumbling down around us. The biggest model reviewed was 900 MB (in multiple files/directories), biggest bill is £0.25M and climbing.

"Do you think users will use Standard Methods?" Only one mandatory step: A risk assessment by management of the criticality of the spreadsheet. Give tools to people to make it easier to self-control their quality, to adhere to standards to allow others to audit the spreadsheet more easily. Auditors don't know about domain errors. We need a safety net (e.g. technical reviews) to mitigate errors that will slip through. Risk can be reduced through the idea of a shadow (parallel high-level) model. What to do if problems found - fixup, re-implement, re-engineer...? Internal Auditors can report to directors on issues that are otherwise overlooked or suppressed.

Commentary to John ("Fritz") Raffensperger: his virtues trade off other virtues.

Operis Analysis Kit (OAK) is useful to detect range name errors, and good for spreadsheet comparisons (version control).

Ray Panko story of how 14% success but >50% confident.

Good teaching is not just "click-bites" but how to recognise and avoid errors. Students need a consciousness of the business costs and consequences of errors. They are surprised that others can have different versions of the same specification. A common teaser that works well is "Can you find all the errors in this?"

Modelling language is good for high dimensionality as it saves multiple repeated formulas in duplicated spreadsheet blocks. Dane Knight: Planning Objects

Mission of EuSpRIG: Best practices compiled in a baseline control document leading to standards in a way similar to which BS7799 evolved.