

**Effort Reporting System Management Group**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**September 13, 2007**  
**Revised October 10, 2007 Accepted October 10, 2007**

This meeting was conducted as a conference call. Participants included: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, John Ellis, Don Larson, Eric Vermillion, Jorge Ohy, Steve Hunter, and Jon Good.

**Discussion Topics:**

Review of 6/13/2007 Meeting Notes

The June 13, 2007, meeting notes were accepted as written.

Project Status

Jon Good and Steve Hunter reported on recent and upcoming releases:

- Release 8.1 was issued in late July and addressed modifications for multiple co-PIs as well as numerous bug fixes.
- Release 8.2 is planned for release in mid-October. The highlight enhancement for this release is the implementation of weighting 11/12 pay. Also included in this release will be the top tier of bug fixes identified by the Requirements Committee.
- Release 9.0 is planned for December 2007. The highlight enhancement for this release will be enhancements for searching and permissions by organizational hierarchy and modifications to compliance reporting.

The Requirements Committee had earlier agreed that outside of urgent fixes, priority should be given to addressing the top tier bug fixes, followed by several top priority enhancements, followed by the remainder of the bug fixes. Releases 8.1 and 8.2 have already been pushed back from earlier scheduled dates due to priority fixes needed, particular in the area of processing late pay.

Beginning with release 9.0, the intent is to move to quarterly releases and provide support only for the two most recent releases. Any releases between quarterly releases will be for urgent fixes only. This approach to releases has been reviewed and endorsed by the Technical Advisory Group.

Requirements Committee Update

The Requirements Committee met via conference call on August 8th. No issues were raised in that discussion which require the attention of the Management Group.

The Requirements Committee will next meet via conference call on Thursday, September 13.

### Technical Advisory Group Update

The Technical Advisory Group has not had a need to meet since the last Management Group meeting.

### Project Finances

Jon referenced the “cash flow” spreadsheet that had been sent out earlier in the morning. Expenses for 2006-2007 have been finalized as have projected expenses for 2007-2008. FY 2006-2007 ended with approximately \$26,000 unspent. Applying this amount to project FY 2007-2008 expenses, the actual funding amount for FY2007-2008 will total \$215,000. In the spreadsheet, the tab “2007-2008 Proration” shows the current estimate of campus funding contributions to Base ERS support for this fiscal year. The prorated campus contributions also reflect the Riverside and Santa Barbara campuses coming up on ERS this fiscal year. These numbers are based on 2005-2006 Total Direct Cost and will be updated in late October when the 2006-2007 TDC amounts are available. The final prorated amounts will be presented at the November meeting at which time the request will be made to transfer funds to UCOP.

### Non-sponsor Campuses - Status

Jon reported that discussions have taken place with both Riverside and Santa Barbara about coming up on ERS this fiscal year, and using the UCOP ERS Hosting service. Both campuses have expressed a desire to bring ERS up in the first quarter of 2008, though given the ramp-up activities required, this might not be a realistic goal. It is planned to bring representatives from both campuses to the October Management Group and Requirements Committee meetings to begin participation in the Base ERS process.

After a brief discussion, the group agreed that all campuses using the ERS should participate in the Management Group, Requirements Committee, and Technical Advisory Group without limitation.

Eric suggested developing a very high-level description of campus participation obligations to memorialize the arrangements on Base ERS support.

### Actions When Effort Is Not Certified

Sue Abeles mentioned that Jon had shared the draft “consequences” statement with the Requirements Committee and received comments. Sue had forwarded those comments to the Management Group earlier in the morning. It was agreed that the comments are very helpful and none seem to present any problems.

After a brief discussion, it was agreed that the reference to the department in escalation steps should be a reference to department, organized research unit, or equivalent.

Sue will take editorial comments and revise the consequences statement for another quick Management Group review before sending to Larry Coleman for coordination with Research Vice Chancellors. Jorge Ohy will arrange for incorporation in the Accounting Manual and inclusion in the Contracts and Grants Manual.

### Differences in Effort Report Format

Background: UCSD had requested an enhancement to the Base ERS to eliminate the cost sharing column from the effort report, since UCSD certifies cost sharing in a separate local system. The Requirements Committee did not endorse this request, since UCSD is the only campus certifying cost sharing in this manner. The issue for discussion among the Management Group is whether there is going to be one UC effort report format or many. While it is true that labels on the effort report can change, the overall format for reporting and adjusting payroll and cost sharing information was developed as a common format.

Don Larson added that a recent discussion with NSF auditors resulted in an opinion that a local cost sharing certification, such as UCSD is using (more detailed than ERS), was acceptable for certifying cost shared effort. Don also noted that the cost sharing column in the effort report is confusing UCSD users, given the fact that cost sharing is certified outside of ERS.

John Ellis remarked that a favorable opinion from one federal agency (NSF) is still an opinion at a point in time that other federal audit teams may not share at a later point in time.

After some discussion about representation of cost-shared effort on the effort report it was agreed to continue this discussion to the October 2007 meeting when the group could see examples of the proposed modified effort report. Don will bring staff who can present the particulars of what's being proposed and help work through unanswered questions.

### Local Modification Requests to ERS

Jon mentioned that the philosophy of the Base ERS has long been one of "one system for all" and, to that end, keeping a single code base without local code modifications has been a goal. As such, source code has not been released to campuses so far. Modifications for local customization purposes will continue to be made in the Base ERS until such time as the Management Group decides that local modifications are the only way in which functionality for a given campus can be implemented.

### Campus Status Reports

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that Berkeley has put a new team together and is targeting to go live with a pilot of 4-6 groups in November, and rollout campus-wide for Fall cycle in February.

Davis – Mike Allred reported that Davis now has about 200 reports remaining to be certified to complete their first 6-month cycle. In a few months they will be preparing for 1/1/2007-9/30/2007 certification cycle.

San Diego– Don Larson reported that San Diego has involved 6 departments (one of which was a division – Dept of Medicine) in its first production phase covering 20% of UCSD PARs; 90% have been certified. In the next cycle, 11 departments will be added to cover 40% of UCSF PARs. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> cycle 80% of UCSD PARs will be covered. Full implementation across campus is scheduled for the 4<sup>th</sup> cycle, in March 2008.

San Francisco – Eric Vermillion reported that things are going well at San Francisco, where ERS is fully implemented. Nothing unusual has been reported.

Los Angeles– [additional information provided by email on 9/14/2007] Sue Abeles reported that Los Angeles is currently in the process of completing three quarters: Summer 2006, Fall 2006, and Winter 2007. These cycles are 72%, 70%, and 70% completed, respectively. UCLA EFM is in the process of following up on the uncertified effort reports.

#### Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled as an in-person meeting in Oakland for **Wednesday, October 10, 2007, from NOON-3:00pm.**

**Effort Reporting System Go-Live Plans  
September 13, 2007**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Effort Reporting Period Start</b>	<b>Calendar Start</b>	<b>UCOP Hosting?</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Status/Comments</b>
<b>Berkeley</b>	to be determined	to be determined	Yes		
<b>Davis</b>	July-December 2006	March 2007	No		In Production March 2007
<b>Los Angeles</b>	Spring quarter 2006	Mid-August 2006	No		In Production September 2006
<b>San Diego</b>	Summer Qtr 2007	August 2007	Yes	Will follow quarterly cycle awaiting annual cycle resolution	To be in limited production week of 6/18/2007
<b>San Francisco</b>	Fall 2006	April 2007	Yes		In Production 4/16/2007
<b>Merced</b>				Will use UCLA ERS	UCLA Overview presentation scheduled for 7/24/2006 at UC Merced
<b>UCOP</b>				Will use UCLA ERS	
<b>Irvine</b>	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005
<b>Riverside</b>	Unknown	Q1 2008	Unknown	Implementation planning about to get underway	ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005 – Overview presented to expanded campus audience 6/19/2006.
<b>Santa Barbara</b>	Unknown	Q1 2008	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 5/22/2006
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	Unknown	2008	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 5/25/2006
<b>DANR</b>				Will use Davis ERS	